







THE
D I V I N E R U L E
OF
FAITH AND PRACTICE;
OR,
A DEFENCE OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
THAT
HOLY SCRIPTURE
HAS BEEN SINCE THE TIMES OF THE APOSTLES
THE SOLE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE TO THE CHURCH,
AGAINST THE DANGEROUS ERRORS OF
THE AUTHORS OF THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES,
AND THE ROMANISTS,
AS, PARTICULARLY, THAT THE RULE OF FAITH IS "MADE UP OF SCRIPTURE AND
TRADITION TOGETHER;" &c.
IN WHICH ALSO THE DOCTRINES OF
The Apostolical Succession, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, &c.
ARE FULLY DISCUSSED.

By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A.
OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; RECTOR OF ST. ANTHOLIN, LONDON.

Hæretici quum ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, . . . quia varie sint dictæ, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant Traditionem. Non enim per litteras traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem.—IRENÆUS.

Φανερά εκπτώσις πίστεως και υπερηφανίας κατηγορία, η αθετει τι των γεγραμμενων, η επεισαγειν των μη γεγραμμενων.—BASIL.

Αυταρκεις εισιν αι άγιοι και θεοπνευστοι γραφαι προς την της αληθειας απαγγελιαν.—ATHANASIUS.

I see not how you differ from that opinion which is THE GROUND OF ALL PAPISTRY, that is, *that all things necessary unto salvation are not expressed in the Scriptures* . . . There is nothing necessary to eternal life which is not both commanded and expressed in the Scripture. I count it expressed when it is either in *manifest* words contained in Scripture, or thereof gathered by *necessary* collection.—ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT.

We of the Church of England affirm that the Scriptures contain a COMPLETE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, and we reject *every doctrine and precept* as essential to salvation, or to be obeyed as divine, which is not supported by their authority.—BISHOP TOMLINE.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.
1842.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO VOL. II.

CHAPTER VIII.

	PAGE
THE SUFFICIENCY AND FULNESS OF THE DIVINE REVELATION CON- VEYED TO US IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES	1—216
<i>Principal Contents.</i>	
Preliminary remarks	1—4
Proofs that all the fundamental articles of the faith are fully set forth in Scripture	4—18
This shown in particular for	
The doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father . . .	7—10
The pre-existence of Christ	10
That the Father is unbegotten	11, 12
The divinity of the Holy Spirit	13, 14
The procession of the Holy Spirit	14, 15
The incarnation of the Son	15—18
Proofs that Scripture is the only authoritative source of all religious truth, "tradition" having no authority over the conscience, either as the interpreter or supplement of Scripture, and moreover of all those rites that are to be considered as of Divine insti- tution	18—215
Statements of the Tractators on this subject	19—23
Enumeration of the doctrines, rites, &c. said by the Tractators to be delivered to us by "tradition," and to depend wholly or partly upon that testimony alone	24, 25
On the points relating to the <i>practice</i> of the Church.	
Introductory remarks	25—30
The non-literal acceptance of our Lord's words respecting washing one another's feet	30—32
The non-observance of the seventh day as a day of religious rest . . .	32—34
Infant baptism	34—38
The sanctification of the first day of the week	38—46
The perpetual obligation of the Eucharist	47, 48

	PAGE
The identity of our mode of consecration in the Eucharist with the Apostolical	48, 49
That consecration by Apostolical authority is essential to the participation of the Eucharist	49—56
The separation of the clergy from the people as a distinct order	56—60
The threefold order of the priesthood	60—66
The government of the Church by Bishops	66—72
The Apostolical succession	72—132
General remarks on the nature of our appeal to antiquity on the above points	132—134
Of points purely doctrinal.	
Baptismal regeneration	134, 135
The virtue of the Eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice	135—190
That there is an intermediate state in which the souls of the faithful are purified and grow in grace, that they pray for us, and that our prayers benefit them	190—201
The descent of Christ into hell, and the validity of baptism performed by heretics	201, 202
Of points concerning matters of fact, &c.	
The canon of Scripture	202
That Melchizedek's feast is a type of the Eucharist	202
That the Book of Canticles represents the union between Christ and his Church	202
That Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs refers to the Second Person of the Trinity	202
The alleged <i>perpetual</i> virginity of the Mother of our Lord	202—215
Reply to objections	215, 216

CHAPTER IX.

THE SUFFICIENCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE TO TEACH MANKIND THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION	217—254
---	---------

Principal Contents.

Introductory remarks	217—223
That all the fundamental and essential points of faith and practice are clearly and plainly delivered in the Scriptures, and consequently that the Scriptures are well adapted and amply sufficient to <i>teach</i> men all such points	223—234
Shown	
(1) From the testimony of Scripture	224—228
(2) From the professed object of the sacred writers of the New Testament, which was to teach all the great truths of the Gospel without concealment or reserve	228—230
(3) From the persons to whom the writings, of the Apostles were addressed	230, 231
(4) From the evident simplicity of the language of the New Testament	231, 232
(5) From its actual effects	232, 233
(6) From the nature of its subject, compared with the revealed character of its Author	233, 234
That <i>all</i> the doctrines of the Christian faith are <i>as</i> plainly delivered in the Scriptures as, to our knowledge, they are <i>revealed</i>	235, 236

That the best and only infallible expositor of Scripture is Scripture; or, in other words, that the best mode of judging of the sense of any passage is by a comparison of it with the testimony of Scripture in other parts; first, by comparing it with the <i>context</i> , with passages <i>similarly</i> worded, with such <i>plain</i> places of Scripture as can illustrate its meaning, and with all that is stated in Scripture respecting the <i>subject</i> treated of; and, secondly, by considering it in connexion with the whole scheme of doctrine clearly revealed in Scripture	236—246
General proofs	236—240
Illustration in the text, "This is my body, &c."	240—246
Replies to objections	246—252
Quotations from Dr. Chaloner and Bishop Horsley on the general subject of this chapter	252—254

CHAPTER X.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK	255—582
---	---------

Principal Contents.

SECTION I.

Preliminary remarks	255—262
Caution necessary	255, 256
Patristical use of the word "tradition"	256—260
General observations	260—262

SECTION II.

On the Tractators' doctrine of catholic consent being a divine informant, supplementary to, and interpretative of, Scripture	262—274
General remarks	262—265
Testimony of,	
Justin Martyr (fl. a. 140.)	265, 266
Origen (fl. a. 230.)	266, 267
Jerome (fl. a. 378.)	267, 268
Augustine (fl. a. 396.)	268
Various testimonies	269—274

SECTION III.

Whether Scripture is the sole and complete Rule of faith and Judge of controversies	274—475
Testimony of	
Ignatius (fl. a. 101.)	274, 275
Polycarp (fl. a. 108.)	275, 276
Justin Martyr (fl. a. 140.)	276, 277
Irenæus (fl. a. 167.)	277—290
Asterius Urbanus (fl. a. 188.)	290, 291
Tertullian (fl. a. 192.)	291—300
Clement of Alexandria (fl. a. 192.)	300—310

	PAGE
Hippolytus the Martyr (fl. a. 220.)	310
Origen (fl. a. 230.)	311—317
Dionysius of Alexandria (fl. a. 247.)	317
Cyprian (fl. a. 248.)	317—325
Lactantius (fl. a. 303.)	325
Eusebius of Cæsarea (fl. a. 315)	325—327
The Council of Nice (a. 325)	327—360
Athanasius (fl. a. 326)	360—370
Cyril of Jerusalem (fl. a. 350.)	371—375
Hilary of Poitiers (fl. a. 354.)	76—392
Epiphanius (fl. a. 368.)	382—388
Optatus (fl. a. 368.)	388—390
Basil of Cæsarea (fl. a. 370.)	390—403
Gregory of Nyssa (fl. a. 370.)	403—409
Ephraem Syrus (fl. a. 370.)	409
Ambrose (fl. a. 374.)	409—411
Jerome (fl. a. 378.)	412—417
Theophilus of Alexandria (fl. a. 385.)	417—419
Rufinus (fl. a. 390.)	419—420
Augustine (fl. a. 396.)	420—435
Chrysostom (fl. a. 398.)	435—445
Cyril of Alexandria (fl. a. 412.)	446—450
Isidore of Pelusium (fl. a. 412.)	450, 451
Theodoret (fl. a. 423.)	451—456
Vincentius of Lirin (fl. a. 434.)	456—470
Salvian (fl. a. 440.)	470, 471
Prosper (fl. a. 444.)	471
Cosmas Indicopleustes (fl. a. 535.)	471, 472
Anastasius of Antioch (fl. a. 561.)	472
Gregory (fl. a. 590.)	472—475

SECTION IV.

Whether Scripture is the sole divine Rule of practice	475—483
Some of the Fathers distinctly advocate the view that, <i>in all points</i> ,	
Holy Scripture is the sole Divine Rule of practice, as—	
Cyprian (fl. a. 248.)	476
Firmilian of Cæsarea (fl. a. 233.)	476, 477
Socrates the historian (fl. a. 439)	477, 478
Of those who appear in some parts of their writings to take the opposite	
view, some have elsewhere so modified their testimony as to leave it	
upon the whole but little different to all practical purposes to that of	
the former, as—	
Jerome (fl. a. 378.)	478, 479
Augustine (fl. a. 396.)	479—482
Were the testimony of these Fathers different to what it is, our oppo-	
nents, both Romanists and Tractators, could not consistently	
maintain that such (supposed) Apostolical traditions are obligatory	
on the Church, because they do not themselves adopt them all	482, 483

SECTION V.

Whether Scripture is sufficiently clear to teach the faith, and how	
its meaning is best ascertained	483—561
Testimony of	
Justin Martyr (fl. a. 140.)	484, 485

	PAGE
Irenæus (fl. a. 167.)	486—490
Theophilus of Antioch (fl. a. 168.)	490, 491
Tertullian (fl. a. 192.)	491—494
Clement of Alexandria (fl. a. 192.)	494—497
Origen (fl. a. 230.)	498—502
Cyprian (fl. a. 248.)	502, 503
Novatian (fl. a. 251.)	503
Gregory of Neocæsarea (fl. a. 254.)	503
Lactantius (fl. a. 303.)	503, 50
Athanasius (fl. a. 326.)	504—509
Anthony (fl. a. 330.)	509
Cyril of Jerusalem (fl. a. 350.)	510, 511
Hilary of Poitiers (fl. a. 354.)	511—517
Epiphanius (fl. a. 368.)	517—521
Basil of Cæsarea (fl. a. 370.)	521—524
Gregory of Nyssa (fl. a. 370.)	525, 526
Ephræm Syrus (fl. a. 370)	526, 527
Macarius of Egypt (fl. a. 373.)	527, 528
Ambrose (fl. a. 374.)	528—530
Jerome (fl. a. 378.)	530—532
Theophilus of Alexandria (fl. a. 385.)	532—534
Augustine (fl. a. 396.)	534—541
Chrysostom (fl. a. 398.)	541—549
Cyril of Alexandria (fl. a. 412.)	549—551
Isidore of Pelusium (fl. a. 412.)	551—553
Theodoret (fl. a. 423.)	553—558
Fulgentius of Ruspa (fl. a. 507)	558—559
Gregory (fl. a. 590.)	559, 560

SECTION VI.

Whether patristical tradition is the ground upon which our belief in the inspiration of Scripture must be founded	561—582
Testimony of	
Justin Martyr (fl. a. 140.)	561—566
Theophilus of Antioch (fl. a. 168.)	566—567
Tatian (fl. a. 172.)	567, 568
Tertullian (fl. a. 192.)	568, 569
Clement of Alexandria (fl. a. 192.)	569—571
Origen (fl. a. 230.)	572—574
Lactantius (fl. a. 303.)	574
Eusebius of Cæsarea (fl. a. 315.)	574, 575
Hilary of Poitiers (fl. a. 354.)	575—577
Augustine (fl. a. 396.)	577—581
Chrysostom (fl. a. 398.)	582

CHAPTER XI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND HER PRINCIPAL DIVINES ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK	583—802
--	---------

Principal Contents.

Preliminary remarks	583—588
-------------------------------	---------

	PAGE
Testimony of	
The Church of England (speaking in her authorized documents) . . .	588—632
Bishop Jewell	632—648
Hooker	648—662
Bishop Morton	662—668
Bishop Hall	668—673
Archbishop Laud	673—685
Jackson	685—707
Archbishop Usher	707—719
Bishop Taylor	719—746
Bishop Stillingfleet	746—768
Bishop Patrick	768—780
Waterland	780—791
Bishop Van Mildert	791—801
Concluding remarks	801, 802

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FULNESS AND SUFFICIENCY OF THE DIVINE REVELATION CONVEYED TO US IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

IN the preceding chapter we have endeavoured to prove that Holy Scripture is the sole divine Rule of faith and practice to the conscience of every individual.

To this position various objections are offered by our opponents, many of which we have already considered. There remain, however, two others of still greater importance, to the consideration of which this and the following chapter shall be devoted.

The first is the (alleged) *imperfection* of Scripture ; the second the (alleged) *obscurity* of Scripture.

The first of these I shall consider in this chapter.

Our opponents assert on this head,¹—

That “ tradition ” is a necessary part of the divine Rule of faith and practice, on account of the defectiveness of Scripture ; for that

(1) Though it does not reveal to us any *fundamental* articles of faith or practice not *noticed* in Scripture, Holy Scripture *containing*, that is, *giving hints or notices of*, all the fundamental articles of faith and practice, it is yet a necessary part of the divine rule of faith and practice as the interpreter of Scripture, and as giving the full development of many articles, some of which are fundamental, which are but imperfectly developed in Scripture ; and

¹ See vol. i. pp. 37, 38.

(2) That tradition is an important part of that rule,¹ as conveying to us various important divinely-revealed doctrines and rules not contained in Scripture.

Now it is evident that in these propositions it is assumed, as an undeniable truth, that patristical tradition is a divine informant; for otherwise it would be no sufficient foundation for our faith to rest upon, either in articles of faith not contained in Scripture, or in the development of truths "noticed" in Scripture. This, however, we have shown not to be the case.

In reply, therefore, to these propositions, (as far as concerns doctrines) we might at once point the reader to the corollaries given in the last chapter,² as affording at once the most brief and satisfactory refutation of them.

Those corollaries were,

(1) That the doctrines contained in Scripture have an authoritative claim upon our faith only *as far as they are there* revealed.

Consequently whereinsoever patristical tradition goes beyond the clear declarations of Scripture in any doctrinal point "noticed" in Scripture, so far faith has no divine or certain testimony to rest upon. Whatever explanation or development not grounded upon the testimony of Scripture is given of any doctrine by "tradition," all the authority it can have is that which belongs to "tradition."

(2) That no doctrine has any authoritative claim upon our faith, that is not revealed in Scripture.

The exclusive claim of Scripture to be the source of all doctrines, is necessarily established, as we have already observed in the last chapter, by a proof of its being our sole divine informant. And, in such a case, it is useless to attempt to argue that Scripture is an *imperfect* informant as to the doctrines of religion, that this or that

¹ Our opponents would not, perhaps, use the phrase "rule of faith," with reference to these points; but they must excuse my using that phrase, as well as others, in the full and proper meaning. If "tradition" is the Word of God, the religious doctrines which it delivers, are articles of faith.

² See vol. i. p. 530.

doctrine is not *fully* set forth in it; and that such and such doctrines are not contained in it at all. For it would only follow that these additions had no title to be reckoned as any part of the Christian faith or religion. For, as Mr. Newman himself justly remarks,—“There is no abstract measure of what is sufficient. Faith cannot believe more than it is told. It is saving if it believes that, be it little or great.”¹

When, therefore, our opponents say that certain fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith are not to be found clearly and fully revealed in Scripture, but that we must rely upon tradition for certain parts, and a full development of them; they are, in fact, sapping the very foundations of the Christian faith, by taking from underneath it the sure support of the written word, and making the rotten pillars of tradition usurp its place. And when we see how clearly these truths are laid down in Scripture, it is difficult to suppose that such an assertion can be made, but from the desire of making use of it on other occasions in defence of propositions, for which the testimony of tradition alone, *if even that*, can be pleaded. But our opponents, with the Romanists, know well the influence and convenience of the argument, (when pressed with the objection that the testimonies of certain Fathers can never be taken as sufficient proof of some of their favourite doctrines,) that we have nothing better to depend upon for the full statement of some of the most fundamental points of faith; and they allege the obscurity of Scripture, and the variety of interpretations given to it, and various other arguments, as proofs of the imperfection of its statements on these points. The consequence of which is, that some, alarmed at the idea of such doctrines being questioned, are, as it were, frightened into the admission of their double rule; and thus the truths of divine revelation, and the dreams of the human imagination, are placed side by side as standing upon the same foundation, and entitled to the same respect. While others, who are indisposed to the recep-

¹ Lect. p. 343.

tion of the truths of revelation, finding that they are made to depend upon the testimony of a few fallible men, instead of the declarations of the inspired Apostles, feel no hesitation in at once rejecting both.

Such are the dangers to which the Christian faith itself is exposed, through the statements of our opponents. To prove the necessity of our receiving, as divine, that patristical tradition on which the peculiarities of their system rely for support, they find fault with that which can alone be shown to be a revelation from God, and represent it as imperfect and obscure, and such as cannot teach men the true faith.

But, whatever may be its relative imperfection or obscurity, one thing is clear, and cannot be too frequently impressed upon the mind of the reader, that if it be our sole divine informant, it has the perfection and entireness for which we here contend—namely, as pointing out all we are required to believe; and, moreover, all those rites that we can know to be of divine institution. The proof, therefore, already given that it is our sole divine informant, is a complete proof of what we contend for in this chapter.

There are, however, other auxiliary arguments to prove this, which we shall now pass on to notice. And in reply to what our opponents assert on this subject, I shall now proceed to show, by these additional arguments,—

First, That all the fundamental articles of the faith are fully set forth in Scripture.

Secondly, That Scripture is the only authoritative source of *all* religious truth, “tradition” having no authority over the conscience, either as the interpreter or supplement of Scripture; and, moreover, of all those rites that are to be considered as of divine institution.

First, then, we maintain that all the fundamental articles of the faith are fully set forth in Scripture.

To guard against misrepresentation, however, let it be remembered, that when we assert this, we mean that all those articles are in Scripture *either* in express terms, or

by necessary consequence. Thus, to recur to the example already given, the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is God, is fully set forth in Scripture ; because, though we do not meet with the proposition in terms, the doctrine flows by necessary consequence from what is contained there. It is obvious to the reason of an unprejudiced mind, from what is said in the Scriptures, that the Holy Spirit is God. And this is all that could reasonably be expected from such a revelation. It was not to be supposed that all the vagaries and distortions of truth that heretics might invent during the whole period of the Church's course, should be met in direct terms by counter propositions in the Scriptures. In fact, however many points might have been so met, those that were not thus met, would have been precisely the points to which heretics would have had recourse. And if it was not to be expected that they should be thus met in the Scriptures, is it probable that they would be more explicitly met in the oral teaching of the Apostles ? Which may show us, that, even if we had the oral teaching of the Apostles, we might probably find in it nothing that would be more definitively and in terms condemnatory of the various heresies that have existed in the Church, than what we meet with in Scripture. The revelation made to us in the Scriptures, be it remembered, is not to be confined to the particular words there made use of, but extends to the sense which those words convey to the mind.

That all the fundamental articles of the faith, then, are, in the sense just mentioned, fully set forth in Scripture, may be shown by various arguments. Of these, however, some of the principal have been already noticed in the preceding chapter, as proofs that Scripture is the Rule of faith ; and, therefore, I shall here only briefly recapitulate them, and refer the reader to the former chapter, where I have endeavoured fully to establish them.

The full exhibition, then, of the fundamentals of the faith in Scripture, appears

First, from Scripture itself. . .

Secondly, from the nature of the Scriptures of the New Testament, as it respects the object for which they were written.

Thirdly, from the committal of the gospel to writing at all, which is a strong argument in favour of *the whole* revealed faith, that is, in all important points at least, having been committed to writing.

Fourthly, from the admission of our opponents, that in necessary points the title of the rule of faith cannot be denied to Scripture.

Fifthly, from the admission of our opponents, that in all fundamental points Scripture is the document of proof, and that Scripture proof of all such doctrines is absolutely necessary.

All these arguments, which we have already entered into at length, necessarily go to prove that Scripture fully sets forth all the essentials of the faith, all that it is necessary to know in order to obtain salvation.

Nor is it at all requisite, in order to establish this position, that we should be able to give an exact catalogue of the fundamental articles. All the arguments we have yet mentioned are perfectly general, and do not affect the question of the precise nature of the fundamental points, but show that *whatever* those points may be, they must be set forth in the Scriptures. The favourite objection of many Romanists, therefore, that we must settle precisely which are the fundamentals of the faith, before we can prove that Scripture fully sets them forth, is altogether groundless.

But as the argument which our opponents seem principally to rely on as a proof of this alleged imperfection of Scripture is, that we do in fact maintain certain points as fundamental articles of the faith which are not fully set forth in Scripture,¹ I shall proceed to show, by a consideration of the instances they adduce, that we have also the *à posteriori* argument in our favour.

We maintain, then, further, in proof of our position,

¹ See Keble's Sermon. pp. 32, 41, 141—3. Newman's Lect. pp. 134, 269.

that no fundamental article of the faith can be mentioned which is not fully set forth either in express terms, or by necessary consequence, in Scripture.

The doctrine which is most frequently and prominently objected to us here, both by our opponents¹ and the Romanists, is, that of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. Not that they *in terms* deny that this doctrine may be proved by Scripture, nay, on the contrary, they maintain (i. e. *in their own meaning of the words*) that it may be *fully proved by Scripture*; but they affirm (how consistently the reader will judge) that it is *not fully delivered in Scripture!* And the reason is this, that the passages of Scripture on the subject do not in themselves carry a sense to the mind of the reader; but if the reader will allow "tradition" to tell him what they mean, then, taking them in that meaning, and no other, they will be *proofs* to him that the doctrine delivered by tradition is the one maintained in Scripture. I am constrained to say, that it is difficult to conceive how such self-deception can be admitted.

To reply to this example, by pointing out those passages of Scripture by which this doctrine is manifested, would, I fear, be useless, because it is to be supposed that our opponents have already considered them, and are prepared to *deny* that they do fully set forth the doctrine in question. I will, therefore, meet them on their own ground, and show them that they are at issue in this matter with those whom they acknowledge as their great and (*as a body*) *authoritative* teachers, the Fathers.

What account does Athanasius give us of the way in which this doctrine, when called in question, was made out by the Nicene Fathers? They "collected together out of the Scriptures these words, the brightness, the fountain, and the river, and the image of the substance, and that expression, 'In thy light shall we see light,' and that, 'I and my Father are one;' and then at last they wrote more plainly and compendiously, that the Son

¹ See Keble's Sermon, pp. 32, 41, 141—3. Newman's Lect. pp. 134, 269.

was consubstantial with the Father, for *all the foregoing expressions have this meaning.*"¹ And again still more clearly;—"The bishops having observed their hypocrisy in this . . . were compelled again to collect the sense of the matter *from the Scriptures*, and to repeat in plainer words what they had said before, and write that the Son was consubstantial with the Father."²

What says Dionysius of Alexandria on this point? "Although," he says, "I have not found this very word [i. e. consubstantial] in the Scriptures, yet collecting their meaning *from the Scriptures themselves*, I was conscious that the Son, being also the Word, could not be of a different substance to the Father."³

Hear, also, Epiphanius.

"But," he says, "if the word [i. e. consubstantial] were not in the Divine Scriptures, *though it is, and plainly occurs in the Law and in the Apostles and Prophets . . .* yet nevertheless it would be lawful for us to use, for the interests of true religion, a convenient word," &c.⁴ And again, still more plainly; "The word substance does not occur in the letter in the Old and New Testament, *but the sense is to be found everywhere.*"⁵

So Ambrose refers entirely to the Scriptures for this doctrine, and says,—“I would not, O sacred Emperor, that you should put your faith in my argument and disputation. Let us interrogate the Scriptures, let us interrogate the Apostles, let us interrogate the Prophets, let us interrogate Christ.”⁶ And again,—“When I consider, O august Emperor, how it is that the human race has so erred, that the majority, alas, follow different opi-

¹ Athanas. Ad Afr. Episc. Epist. § 6. See the passage, c. 10, below.

² See c. 10, below.

³ Εἰ καὶ μὴ τὴν λέξιν ταύτην εὕρον ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν τὸν νοῦν συναγαγὼν, ἐγνων ὅτι υἱὸς ὢν καὶ λόγος οὐ ξένος ἀν εἰς τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς. Dionys. Alex. in Athan. Epist. De sent. Dionys. § 20. Op. ed. Ben. tom. i. p. 257.

⁴ See c. 10, below.

⁵ Ib.

⁶ De fid. lib. i. c. 6. See c. 10, below.

nions concerning the Son of God, the wonder to me is not by any means that human learning has erred concerning heavenly things, but that it has not been *obedient to the Scriptures*.”¹

And Augustine says,—“Against the impiety of the Arian heretics the Fathers *made a new word consubstantial*; but they did not by this word express a new thing; for the name consubstantial is the same in meaning as, ‘I and my Father are one,’ namely, of one and the same substance.”²

It would be easy to add to these passages from other Fathers, but I suppose these will be considered sufficient.³

And as it respects the divines of our own Church, the reader will see, in the extracts given hereafter from the works of Jewell, Jeremy Taylor, &c., that the same view is stoutly maintained by them against the opposite doctrine of the Church of Rome.⁴

Nay, let us hear Bellarmine himself on this point. When pressed in the controversy on tradition by that passage of Augustine, in which he tells the Arian Maximinus, that for an authoritative decision of the point in dispute, they must not go either to the Council of Nice or that of Ariminum, but at once to Scripture, he says, that the cause was twofold, First, that he might argue more expeditiously, and, secondly, “because in the questions then at issue, *there were in Scripture the very clearest testimonies*, which beyond doubt are to be preferred to all the testimonies of Councils.”⁵

¹ De fid. lib. iv. c. 1. See c. 10. below.

² Adversus impietatem quoque Arianorum hæreticorum novum nomen patris [patres] Homousion condiderunt; sed non rem novam tali nomine signaverunt; hoc enim vocatur Homousion quod est, Ego et Pater unum sumus, unius videlicet ejusdemque substantiæ. Aug. In Joh. Ev. c. 16. Tract. 97. § 4. Op. tom. iii. p. 2. col. 738; and see Contr. Maximin. lib. ii. c. 14. § 3. tom. viii. col. 704.

³ For others, see the extracts from Cyril. Alex. &c. in c. 10. below.

⁴ See chap. 11. below.

⁵ Quia in illis quæstionibus quæ tunc erant exstabant in Scriptura clarissima testimonia, quæ sine dubio anteponenda sunt omnibus Conciliorum testimoniis. Bell. De Verb. Dei, lib. iv. c. 11.

I hope, then, that I may conclude, not only from the language of Scripture itself, but upon the testimony of those to whom our opponents look as their guides in such matters, that we want nothing but Scripture for the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father.

It is still more painful to have to add, that even the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ against the Socinians, has been brought forward in this controversy as one upon which Scripture is not sufficiently explicit, and which therefore must be defended from tradition. Nay, we are told that if we were good logicians we should be Socinians.¹

On this point I shall only refer the reader to the extract already given in a former page from Dr. Hawardine, which will show him that *even some Romanists* have opposed such a notion, and maintained that this is a point in which Scripture is *clear*, and which "may be *decided* by the Holy Scripture alone," and have ridiculed the notion upon which Dr. Hook relies, that because men contest the matter, therefore it is not *decided* in Scripture.²

To what other points Mr. Keble may allude when he tells us that we are indebted to "tradition" for the full doctrine of the Trinity,³ I know not, but fear that upon the same grounds on which he has attributed to it our knowledge of the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, he would join with the Romanists in tracing to it our knowledge of various other points, namely, the doctrine that the Father is unbegotten, that of the divinity of the Holy Spirit,⁴ and that also of his

¹ See extracts from Dr. Hook, in vol. i. p. 635.

² See vol. i. p. 609.

³ Serm. pp. 32, 41.

⁴ Thus speaks the 85th of the Tracts for the Times; "A person who denies the Apostolical succession of the ministry, because it is not clearly taught in Scripture, ought, I conceive, if consistent, to deny the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, which is nowhere literally stated [he means "*if consistent*" "not clearly taught"] in Scripture." (p. 4.)

procession from the Father and the Son, our knowledge of all which is traced by the Romanists to tradition. Not that they would deny, any more than our opponents, that there are some *notices* of these doctrines in Scripture, and some testimonies which, when explained and developed by tradition, speak these doctrines. But they assert that they are not fully delivered in Scripture.

As it respects the first of these, viz., that the Father is unbegotten, they defend themselves by a passage of Augustine, which we need only connect with the context, to show that Augustine was of a completely opposite opinion. He says, in a letter to Pascentius, that when the latter presented to him his creed with the word "unbegotten" (*ingenitum*) in it applied to the Father, he asked him where this word was to be found in the Scriptures; with the meaning, I fully admit, that though not in the Scriptures, it was to be received. But why did he do this? His own words tell us. "But this," he says, "I did, because, in the beginning of our discourse, when Arius and Eunomius were mentioned . . . you anathematized both Arius and Eunomius, and then immediately demanded that we also should anathematize the Homousion . . . You then vehemently demanded that we should show this word to you in the Scriptures, and you would immediately join in communion with us. We replied that, since we spoke in Latin, and that was a Greek word, it was first to be inquired what Homousion was; and then the demand to be made that it should be shown in the Sacred Books. You, on the contrary, often repeating the word itself . . . vehemently urged that we should show the very word which is, [or signifies] Homousion, in the Sacred Books; we at the same time over and over again recalling to you that, inasmuch as our language was not Greek, it was first to be interpreted and explained what Homousion meant, and then it was to be inquired for in the Divine Writings; *because although, perchance, the word itself could not be found, yet the thing itself might be found.* For what is more litigious, than when

*the thing itself is clear, to contend about a name?*¹ *Inasmuch, therefore, as this conversation had passed between us, after the matter proceeded to your writing your creed, as I have mentioned, although I saw nothing in the words contrary to my creed, and therefore I said that I was ready to subscribe; I inquired, as I said, whether the Divine Scripture contained this word, that the Father was unbegotten. And when you replied that it was written, I immediately asked you to show me where. Then one who was present, a companion, as far as I understand, of your faith, says to me, 'What! then, do you say that the Father is begotten?' I replied, 'I do not say so.' Then he said, 'If, therefore, he is not begotten, he must be unbegotten.' To whom I said, 'You see that it may happen that even respecting a word which is not in the Divine Scripture, a reason may be given, showing that it may be rightly used. So, therefore, as to Homousion, which we were required to show in the authority of the Divine books, although we may not find there the word itself, it may happen that we may find that to which this word may be judged to be rightly applied.'*²

This passage, therefore, taken *with its context*, shows that Augustine was, in fact, *contending* both that this doctrine and that of the consubstantiality were fully set forth *in Scripture*, although these two particular words, "consubstantial" and "unbegotten," were not there; and that the thing only, and not the name, was worth contending about. And further on he clearly attributes the errors of men respecting Christ, to their not *studying the Scriptures*.³

¹ Quia etsi fortasse nomen ipsum non inveniretur, res tamen ipsa inveniretur. Quid est enim contentiosius, quam ubi de re constat certare de nomine?

² Aug. Epist. 238. Ad Pasc. c. 1. Tom. 2. col. 854.

³ Homines autem minus intelligentes quid propter quid dicatur patentes volunt habere sententias; et, *Scripturis non diligenter scrutatis*, cum arripiunt defensionem cujusque opinionis, et ab ea vel nunquam vel difficile defleuntur, dum docti atque sapientes magis putari quam esse concupiscunt, ea quæ propter formam servi dicta sunt volunt transferre ad formam Dei, et rursus quæ dicta sunt ut ad se invicem personæ referantur, volunt nomina esse naturæ atque substantiæ. c. 2. col. 857.

And such passages as this clearly, though indirectly, show, what was Augustine's *sole* rule of faith in such points; for had he held the views of our opponents, he would have argued on these points as they do. But this by the way, as we shall advert to this more fully hereafter.

Further, as to the doctrine of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, what says Augustine, in the very letter to which we have just referred? "Now, for a short space," he says, "contemplate the passages of Scripture which *compel* us to confess one Lord God, whether we are interrogated respecting the Father only, or the Son only, or *the Holy Spirit only*, or of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together."¹

Still more strongly speaks the great Athanasius, in his Epistle to Serapion, against those who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. "To all created beings," he says, "and especially to us men, it is impossible to speak worthily of things which are beyond our power of expression; and it is still more audacious for those who cannot express them, to *excogitate new words beyond those of the Scriptures*."² And, again, still more clearly;—"Such an attempt, therefore, being full of madness, and worse, let not any one any longer ask such questions, but *learn only what is in the Scriptures; for the illustrations we have of this matter in them, are sufficient of themselves, and need no addition*."³ To which I will only add the words of Bishop Pearson, (one of our opponents' witnesses,) "The Scriptures do *clearly manifest* the same Spirit to be God, and

¹ Jam nunc paululum intueri quæ Scripturarum eloquia nos cogant unum Dominum Deum confiteri, sive tantum de Patre, sive tantum de Filio, sive tantum de Spiritu Sancto, sive simul de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto interrogemur. Aug. Ep. 238. Ad. Pasc. c. 3. Tom. 2. col. 858, 9.

² Εστι μὲν γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖς γενήτοις, μάλιστα δὲ ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀδύνατον, ἐπαξίως εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν ἀπορρητῶν. Τολμηροτέρον δὲ πάλιν μὴ δυναμένοις λεγεῖν, ἐπινοεῖν ἐπὶ τούτων καινότερας λέξεις πῦρα τὰς τῶν γραφῶν. Athanas. Ep. 1. Ad Serap. § 17. Tom. 1. p. 2. p. 666.

³ Περίττης τοιγαροῦν καὶ πλέον μανίας οὐσης τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιχειρήσεως, μήκετι τοιαῦτα τις ἐρωτᾷ, ἢ μόνον τὰ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς μανθάνετω. Ἀνταρκὴ γὰρ καὶ ἴκανα τὰ ἐν ταύταις κείμενα περὶ τούτου παραδείγματα. Athanas. Ep. 1. Ad Serap. § 19. Op. tom. 1. p. 2. p. 667.

term him *plainly and expressly* so." (On the Creed, Art. 8.)

And, lastly, as it respects the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, as well as the Father, it is said by Augustine, after he has adduced various passages of Scripture in which it is contained, "And there are many other passages by which this is clearly shown, that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit both of the Father and the Son."¹ Nay, we may quote several of the Romanists themselves in behalf of its being fully set forth in Scripture. "Although," saith Thomas Aquinas, "it may not be found in so many words in Holy Scripture, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, yet it is found, as far as concerns the sense; and particularly where the Son says, John xvi. speaking of the Holy Spirit, 'He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine.'" And he proceeds to adduce other passages.² So Eustathius a S. Paulo;—"It is proved, first, by the authority of the Holy Scriptures, from which it is *clearly enough* gathered."³ So also Becanus;—"Although it may not be in express terms in the Scriptures, yet, nevertheless, it may be *clearly* deduced from thence."⁴

Nor need we be at all surprised at this; for there is much contradiction among the Romanists themselves on such points. For though they are agreed that tradition is necessary, even for the fundamental points, yet as to the points for which it is necessary, they seem far from agreed. And I believe that for all these points, we could easily prove upon the testimony of Romanists, both that

¹ Et multa alia sunt testimonia quibus hoc evidenter ostenditur, et Patris et Filii esse Spiritum, qui in Trinitate dicitur Spiritus Sanctus. In Joh. Ev. c. 16. Tract. 99. § 6. Op. Tom. 3. p. 2. col. 747.

² Licet per verba non inveniatur in Sacra Scriptura quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Filio, invenitur tamen quantum ad sensum, et præcipue ubi dicit Filius, Joh. 16. de Spiritu S. loquens, Ille me clarificabit, quia de meo accipiet. Summ. Theol. 1. q. 36. Art. 2.

³ Probatur imprimis autoritate sacrarum Scripturarum ex quibus id aperte satis colligitur. Summ. Theolog. P. 1. Tract. 2. disp. 8. q. 2.

⁴ Licet expresse non habeatur in Scripturis, potest tamen evidenter inde deduci. Becan. Summ. Theolog. P. 1. Tract. 2. c. 6. q. 2.

they were fully set forth in Scripture, and also that they were not. And the fact is, that in general, if they are writing expressly upon a particular doctrine, then they can see and admit that Scripture is full and clear on the point; but if they are advocating the necessity of tradition against the Protestants, then there is hardly a doctrine which is fully and clearly set forth in the Scriptures.

Lastly, thus speaks our opponents' own witness, Bishop Pearson. "As, therefore, the Scriptures declare expressly that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so do they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son. From whence it came to pass, in the primitive times, that the Latin Fathers taught expressly the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son; *because, by good consequence, they did collect so much from those passages of the Scripture which we have used to prove that truth.*" (On the Creed. Art. 8.)

Further, if it be not fully and clearly set forth in the Scriptures, how can we be certain of it at all, even if we were to admit our opponents' system? For neither they nor the Romanists can, *upon their own principles*, say that this doctrine is clearly delivered by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, when the whole Greek Church have for centuries denied that the primitive Fathers of their Church maintained it. Nor could this doctrine, as it appears to me, be *clearly* proved to have had the witness of the early Greek Fathers in its favour.

Mr. Keble adds, that we are indebted to tradition for the full doctrine of the Incarnation;¹ which means, I suppose, that, like the Romanists, he maintains that, because the Nestorians, Eutychians, and others, attempted to defend an unorthodox doctrine on this point from the Scriptures, therefore the Scriptures cannot fully set forth the orthodox doctrine respecting it.

On this point, I shall merely refer the reader to the admirable Encyclical Letter of Leo I., in which he thus speaks.

¹ Serm. p. 41.

“ But what,” he says, “ can be worse than to hold impious notions, and not to believe the wise and learned? But into this folly do those fall who, when they are hindered in arriving at a knowledge of the truth by some obscurity, do not go to *the words of the Prophets, nor to the Epistles of the Apostles, nor to the testimonies of the Evangelists*, but to themselves. And on that account are teachers of error, because they have not become disciples of the truth. For what learning has he acquired from the sacred pages of the New Testament, who does not even know the elementary points of the Creed itself? And that which is uttered by the voice of all the regenerate throughout the world, is not yet received in the heart of that old man [viz. Eutyches.] When ignorant, therefore, what he ought to think concerning the incarnation of the Word of God, *and not willing to labour in the wide field of the Holy Scriptures, to gain the light of understanding*, he should at least have attended with an earnestly-attentive ear to that common and universally-received confession, by which the whole body of the faithful professes its belief in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was born of the Virgin Mary, by the Holy Spirit, by which three sentences the devices of almost all heretics are destroyed But if he could not draw a correct knowledge of the truth from this most pure fountain of the Christian faith, because, by his own blindness, he had obscured the splendour of the truth, when shining clearly before him, he should have submitted himself to *the teaching of the Gospel, Matthew saying*, ‘ The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham ;’ and should have sought the instruction of *the Apostolical preaching, and reading in the Epistle to the Romans*,¹ ‘ Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle, separated unto the gospel

¹ The reader will observe here the phrases “ doctrina Evangelica” and “ Apostolica prædicatio” used for *the Scriptures*, the former for the gospels, the latter for the Epistles, as is common with the Fathers, and most important to note in this controversy.

of God, which he had promised before by his Prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning his Son, who was made to him of the seed of David, according to the flesh,' [Rom. i. 1—3] should have betaken himself with pious solicitude to *the pages of the Prophets*, and would have found the promise of God to Abraham, saying, 'In thy seed shall all nations be blessed.' [Gen. xxii. 18.] And that he might have no doubt respecting the reality of this seed, should have followed the Apostle, saying, 'To Abraham were the promises made.' [Gal. 3.]" And so he proceeds to show how clearly and fully the doctrine is set forth in Scripture.¹

Here, then, I suppose it is undeniable that, for a knowledge of the truth, men are sent to the Holy Scriptures; and that Leo supposed that it was impossible for a man to have made himself at all acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, who did not receive the "*initia*" of the creed,

¹ Quid autem iniquius quam impia sapere, et sapientioribus doctioribusque non credere? Sed in hanc insipientiam cadunt, qui, cum ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad Propheticas voces, non ad Apostolicas literas, nec ad Evangelicas Autoritates, sed ad semetipsos recurrunt. Et ideo magistri erroris existunt quia veritatis discipuli non fuere. Quam enim eruditionem de sacris Novi et Veteris Testamenti paginis acquisivit, qui nec ipsius quidem Symboli initia comprehendit? Et quod per totum mundum omnium regeneratorum voce depromitur, istius adhuc senis corde non capitur. Nesciens igitur, quid deberet de Verbi Dei incarnatione sentire, nec volens ad promerendum intelligentiæ lumen in Sanctarum Scripturarum latitudine laborare, illam saltem communem et indiscretam confessionem sollicito apprehendisset auditu, qua fidelium universitas profitetur credere se in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine. Quibus sententiis tribus omnium fere hæreticorum machinæ destruuntur Sed si de hoc fidei Christianæ fonte purissimo sincerum intellectum haurire non poterat, quia splendorem perspicuæ veritatis obcæcatione sibi propria tenebrarat, doctrinæ se Evangelicæ subdidisset, dicente Matthæo: *Liber generationis Jesu Christi filii David filii Abraham*: Apostolicæ quoque prædicationis expetisset instructum, et legens in Epistola ad Romanos; *Paulus servus Jesu Christi*, &c. ad propheticas paginas piam sollicitudinem contulisset, et invenisset promissionem Dei ad Abraham dicentis, *In semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes*. Et ne de hujus seminis proprietate dubitaret, secutus fuisset apostolum dicentem, *Abrahæ dictæ sunt promissiones*, &c. [Gal. 3.]" Leonis I. Epist. ad Flavianum Ep. Constant. lecta et approb. in Concil. Chalced. Vid. Acta Concil. Chalced. Act. 2. Concil. ed. 1671. Tom. 4. col. 345.

including the true doctrine of the Incarnation. And he urges attention to the creed for learning the doctrine of the Incarnation, only on the supposition that a man is "*not willing to labour in the wide field of the Holy Scriptures, to gain the light of understanding;*" and still further, so far from supposing that the creed was clearer or fuller than the Scriptures on the point, he urges that if a man should not be able to obtain a correct knowledge of the faith from the creed, he is bound to search the Scriptures with pious solicitude, and submit to the declarations which he finds there; which Leo evidently considers to convey a clear and full declaration of the orthodox doctrine. Can there, then, be a more direct contradiction given to the notion that the full doctrine of the Incarnation is not in Scripture, than is contained in this celebrated letter of Leo, which was publicly read and approved in the Council of Chalcedon, and is inserted in its acts?

Our opponents, indeed, will find that the early Fathers, far from taking the tradition of earlier Fathers as part of their rule of faith, or supposing that the full doctrine was only to be found there, in this as in other points, made the Scriptures their *rule*. "We," says Theophilus of Alexandria, when opposing the notion of the Origenists as to the preexistence of the human soul of Christ,—"*We, following the rule of the Scriptures, will preach with our whole heart and soul, that neither his flesh nor soul existed before he was born of Mary.*"¹

Secondly,—It is maintained that Scripture is the only authoritative source of *all* religious truth, "tradition" having no authority over the conscience, either as the interpreter or supplement of Scripture, and moreover of all those rites that are to be considered as of divine institution.

This, as we have already observed, is most fully proved by the fact that we have no divine informant but Scrip-

¹ Nos Scripturarum normam sequentes tota cordis audacia prædicemus, quod nec caro illius nec anima fuerint priusquam de Maria nasceretur. THEOPH. ALEX. Ep. Pasch. II. § 8. See the whole passage in c. 10, below.

ture, and, therefore, that we have no divine or certain testimony for any point of religion not to be found there. And as regards all really *important* points, we might also refer to the arguments adduced on the last head, as alone going far to show that Scripture must fully set them forth.

But here, as in the last case, our opponents, with the Romanists, attempt to show that we receive doctrines and practices as divinely revealed, some of which are not contained at all, and others but imperfectly noticed, in Scripture, and take advantage of the appeals sometimes made by us to the practice of the primitive Church on some points, as if they proved that we were compelled sometimes to go to tradition for the proof of doctrines and rites which we receive as divine, though we refuse to abide by it in other points. We shall therefore proceed to consider the examples they bring upon this head, and show that there are no doctrines received by us as *certain* truths, *i. e.* as revelations from God, and consequently articles of faith, of which, or any part of which, our belief rests upon the testimony of tradition, but that our belief, in all such cases, is founded wholly upon Scripture; and that we receive no rites as of divine institution but such as are delivered to us in the Scriptures.

The principal passages in which our opponents have spoken of these points, are the following, in some of which the points of which we are now speaking are mixed up with those which we have already considered under the former head, but we quote the passages as they stand. "The matter of fact," says Mr. Newman, "is not at all made out, that there are no traditions of a trustworthy nature. For instance, it is proved by traditionary information only (for there is no other way), that the text of Scripture is not to be taken literally concerning our washing one another's feet, while the command to celebrate the Lord's Supper is to be obeyed in the letter. Again, it is only by tradition that we have any safe and clear rule for changing the weekly feast from the seventh

to the first day. Again, our divines, such as Bramhall Bull, Pearson, and Patrick, believe that the Blessed Mary was 'Ever Virgin,' as the Church has called her, but tradition was their only informant on the subject." (Lect. pp. 334, 5.) "We consider the eucharist is of perpetual obligation, because the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles thought so; we consider the inspired Canon was cut short in the Apostles, whose works are contained in the New Testament, and that their successors had no gift of expounding the Law of Christ, such as they had, because the same ages so accounted it." (Ib. p. 371.)

"It may be proved," says Mr. Keble, "to the satisfaction of any reasonable mind, that not a few fragments yet remain—very precious and sacred fragments of the unwritten teaching of the first age of the Church. The paramount authority, for example, of the successors of the Apostles in Church Government; the threefold order established from the beginning; the virtue of the blessed eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice; infant baptism; and above all, the catholic doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity, as contained in the Nicene creed. All these, however surely *confirmed* from Scripture, are yet ascertainable parts of the primitive unwritten system of which we yet enjoy the benefit. If any one ask, how we ascertain them, we answer, by the application of the well-known rule, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*" (Keble's Sermon. p. 32.) "Without its aid [*i. e.* 'primitive tradition'] humanly speaking, I do not see how we could now retain either real inward communion with our Lord through his Apostles, or the very outward face of God's Church and kingdom among us. Not to dwell on disputable cases, how but by the tradition and practice of the early Church can we demonstrate the observance of Sunday as the holiest day, or the permanent separation of the clergy from the people as a distinct order? Or where, except in the primitive liturgies, a main branch of that tradition, can we find assurance, that in the Holy

Eucharist, we consecrate as the Apostles did, and consequently, that the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break the communion of the body of Christ." (Ib. p. 38.)

"The points of Catholic consent, known by tradition, constitute the knots and ties of the whole system; being such as these: the canon of Scripture, the full doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, the oblation and consecration of the Eucharist, the Apostolical succession." (Ib. pp. 41, 2.) "To which, perhaps, it might have been well to add the doctrine of baptismal regeneration." (Ib. p. 75.)

"How else could we know, with tolerable certainty, that Melchizedek's feast is a type of the blessed eucharist? or that the book of Canticles is an allegory, representing the mystical union betwixt Christ and his Church? or that Wisdom, in the Book of Proverbs, is a name of the Second Person in the Most Holy Trinity? All which interpretations, the moment they are heard, approve themselves to an unprejudiced mind." (Ib. p. 36.) To which he adds (p. 78) the doctrine "that consecration by Apostolical authority is essential to the participation of the Eucharist," which he thinks was "universally received in the primitive Church," and may be accepted by us on the evidence of a passage in Ignatius, even if it could not be "at all proved from Scripture," which, however, he thinks it may, "in a great measure, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds."

To these may be added the following, from the 85th of the "Tracts for the Times." "Even though Scripture be considered to be altogether *silent* as to the intermediate state, and to pass from the mention of death to that of the judgment, there is nothing in this circumstance to disprove *the Church's doctrine* (if there be *other* grounds for it), that there is an intermediate state, and that it is important, that in it the souls of the faithful are purified, and grow in grace, that they pray for us, and that our prayers benefit them." (p. 48.) This doctrine, therefore, the author of the tract would evidently class among

those which we are now considering, either as one about which Scripture spoke indistinctly and obscurely, or might be considered by some as altogether *silent*. And we may observe from this passage, that there are, in the view of our opponents, important *Church doctrines*, about which, if Scripture “be considered to be altogether *silent*,” it matters not. There are “other grounds” of proof in patristical tradition. And if patristical tradition be what our opponents represent it to be, it is sufficient for the proof of such doctrines. And so speaks the author of Tract 79, entitled, “On Purgatory.” “It can only,” he says, “be *an article of faith*, supposing it is held by antiquity, and that unanimously. For such things only are we allowed to maintain as come to us from the Apostles; and that only, *ordinarily speaking*, has evidence of so originating, which is witnessed by *a number of independent witnesses in the early Church*. We must have the unanimous consent of Doctors as *an assurance that the Apostles have spoken*.” (p. 25.) And they are only consistent in making these statements, that is, consistent as far as their system is concerned, not with themselves, because out of regard, I suppose, to the *prejudices* of Protestants, they every now and then introduce statements of a very different complexion. I do not, of course, mean with any intention to mislead, but their position involuntarily leads them to do so.¹ They are committed to two opposite systems. Having embraced the great principles upon which

¹ In the same tract, pp. 9 & seq., the author enumerates various ordinances and doctrines about which “*little* is said in Scripture,” in order to meet a supposed argument that little is said there as to some of their favourite notions, and he accordingly mentions various points as either not taught in so many words in Scripture, or having only so many texts relating to them. This list I do not notice here, because it is beside the question as far as our arguments are concerned. We do not ask whether every doctrine is taught in so many words in Scripture, but whether virtually it is clearly there, nor how many texts support a doctrine, but whether the doctrine is clearly in those texts. And when he asks us, “what doctrines would be left to us if we demanded the clearest and fullest evidence,” (p. 12.) we reply, all those which either follow immediately by just and necessary inference from Scripture, or are supported by even *one* clear passage of Scripture.

Popery is founded, though perhaps not quite satisfied with the whole superstructure which Rome has built upon them, while, partly from personal attachment, and partly from dislike of some parts of Romanism, they remain members of the Church of England, and are consequently obliged to explain their tenets so as to make them appear consistent with the authorized documents of our Church, they are continually uttering contradictory statements.

The cases here enumerated (which I need hardly say are precisely the examples adduced by the Romanists) are of various kinds, and not all to be met in the same way. Some of them rest, or are supposed to rest, on Scripture and tradition together, others on tradition alone; though there is by no means a universal agreement in the classification of them in this respect, some writers referring to Scripture and tradition together what others make to rest on tradition alone. Moreover, some of these doctrines we reject, others, as dependent on tradition only, we look upon as uncertain, and not to be authoritatively propounded as of divine revelation or obligation. For others we want nothing but Scripture, though we may appeal to the writings of the Fathers in *confirmation* of the correctness of our deductions, and in matters relating to the *practice* of the Church with respect to *facts and practices of which the senses of the writers were cognizant*, we may use those writings as conclusive evidence that they took place in the Church in their times. And further, as to the subject matter of these examples, they are of diverse kinds, referring partly and principally to points relating to the *practice* of the Church, that is, ecclesiastical ordinances, rites, and usages, partly also to points purely doctrinal, and partly to points which concern matters of fact and things somewhat different to both the former. In our consideration of them we shall classify them according to this last arrangement.

Of points relating to the *practice* of the Church, then, we find the following.

Relating to rites disused,—

(1) The non-literal acceptance of our Lord's words respecting washing one another's feet.

(2) The non-observance of the seventh day as a day of religious rest.

Relating to ordinances and observances in use among us,—

(1) Infant baptism.

(2) The sanctification of the first day of the week.

(3) The perpetual obligation of the Eucharist.

(4) The identity of our mode of consecration in the Eucharist with the Apostolical.

(5) That consecration by Apostolical authority is essential to the participation of the Eucharist.

(6) The separation of the clergy from the people as a distinct order.

(7) The threefold order of the priesthood.

(8) The Government of the Church by Bishops.

(9) The Apostolical succession.

Of points purely doctrinal,—

(1) Baptismal regeneration.

(2) The virtue of the Eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice.

(3) That there is an intermediate state, in which the souls of the faithful are purified, and grow in grace; that they pray for us, and that our prayers benefit them.

Of points concerning matters of fact, and things that do not immediately belong either to the doctrines or rites of Christianity,—

(1) The Canon of Scripture.

(2) That Melchizedek's feast is a type of the Eucharist.

(3) That the Book of Canticles represents the union between Christ and his Church.

(4) That Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs refers to the Second Person of the Trinity.

(5) The alleged *perpetual* virginity of the Mother of our Lord.

To the doctrines above mentioned Romanists add, among others, the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell, and that of the validity of baptism administered by heretics.

It is impossible not to see that, among all these points, the *stress* is laid upon those that concern the *government* and the *sacraments* of the Church; and our opponents, being persuaded that patristical tradition delivers their system on these points, (and it would be wonderful if in all the volumes of the Fathers they could not find some passages in favour of a system so zealously patronized by those in whose hands these works were for centuries deposited, and through whom they have come down to us, though we deny that it is to be found there upon any full and consentient testimony,) are very anxious that this tradition should be recognized as a divine informant; and in the zealous prosecution of this enterprize, are desirous further of impressing it upon our minds, that almost all the other points relating either to doctrine or practice, yea even the fundamentals of the faith, must stand or fall according as this recognition takes place or not.

Let us first consider the points relating to the *practice* of the Church; and before we proceed to consider them individually, we would premise a few general remarks as to the principles which guide us in the consideration of such cases.

In the first place it must be remembered, that we are far from maintaining here, with the early Puritans, that all the rites and usages of the Church must have Scripture authority, so that no Church can appoint and require from her members an observance of any rites or ceremonies but what are ordained in Scripture; but we assert this only of points for which is claimed the authority of divine revelation, or the obligation of a divine or apostolical precept, binding *Churches* as well as individuals.

In the second place, though we deny that the testi-

mony of a few Fathers can be taken as such sufficient evidence of the doctrine orally taught by the Apostles, or the universal Church, in matters of faith or practice, as to be considered a divine informant supplementary to Scripture, we do not deny, but on the contrary maintain, that the testimony of the early Fathers respecting facts and practices *of which their senses were cognizant*, is sufficient to assure us that such facts and practices took place in their time in the primitive Church, just as we might receive the testimony of our opponents as quite sufficient respecting facts and practices of our Church, *of which their senses had been cognizant*, while we took leave altogether to deny its sufficiency as a witness of the *doctrines* of our Church.

And, thirdly, we maintain that the usage of the primitive orthodox Church from Apostolical times (as far as it can be ascertained) may justly be taken as a guide to show us how rites and practices enjoined in Scripture are to be carried into effect; and also as a guide to a certain extent in its general rites and practices, that is, so far as to recommend them to our attention, and perhaps to justify modern Churches in following them, inasmuch as it is not probable that, from the very first, the orthodox Church should have adopted a superstitious or improper usage. It is on this ground that our Church defends her use of the sign of the cross, as—not necessary, but—justifiable.¹ And, consequently, we receive with respect the traditions of the primitive Church on such points, “*meaning by traditions*,” as Hooker says, “*ordinances made in the prime of Christian religion*, established with that authority which Christ hath left to his Church for matters indifferent, and in that consideration requisite to be observed till like authority see just and reasonable cause to alter them. So that traditions ecclesiastical are not rudely and in gross to be shaken off, because *the inventors of them were men*.”²

And thus, as it respects rites and usages, the practice of the primitive Church, ascertained to us by the testi-

¹ See Canon 30.

² Book v. c. 65.

mony of its writings, may be a useful guide to us, both where Scripture is silent, and where it does not enter so fully into particulars as to show how the rites and ceremonies mentioned in it are to be carried out in all cases.

But we maintain, with our Church, that those rites and ordinances only are *essentially* binding upon all Churches and individuals that are required by Scripture authority ; because no others can be proved to have been established by the Apostles ; and we shall show hereafter, that all the moderns who profess to hold a contrary opinion are convicted by their own conduct of inconsistency ; for they who maintain, that a few patristical assertions, that this or that rite was established by the Apostles, or observed by the primitive Church, are to be taken as sufficient evidence of its Apostolical origin and binding nature, ought to contend for *all* those that are so supported.

And if even the testimony of antiquity on one or two points enjoined in Scripture should be considered sufficient to have proved their apostolicity in the absence of Scripture testimony for them, this would make no practical difference in our argument. For the great question is, whether Scripture does not fully and clearly reveal all the fundamental points of faith and practice, and whether there is any point of faith or practice not revealed in Scripture for which a traditional testimony can be adduced sufficient to show its Apostolical origin.

Our Church has wisely taken in this matter the middle course between that of the Romanists and that of our early Nonconformists, the former professing to take the statements of the remaining Fathers as an unerring guide, and the latter holding " that Scripture is the only rule of all things which in this life may be done by men,"¹ and both of them in their practice acting very inconsistently with their professed principles. When, therefore, the latter demanded that nothing should be re-

¹ See Hooker, Eccl. Pol. bk. ii.

quired by the Church but what was laid down in Scripture, because those precepts only can be proved to be Apostolical, and therefore essentially binding, that are found in Scripture, our Church, while fully admitting the truth of the latter proposition, denied the justice of the demand, claiming a power to ordain rites and ceremonies such as might be necessary for the preservation of order and decency, and require their observance of her members; and to cut off as much as possible all occasion for cavilling, as well as from the inherent propriety of such a course, adhered as closely as possible to the primitive model.

The reader will observe, then, that when admitting the non-necessity of any ecclesiastical ordinances, rites, or observances, I am speaking with reference either to the Church at large, or some distinct and independent portion of it; and, with respect to such bodies, certainly maintain, that they are not bound by any injunctions but those of Scripture. With individuals, however, the case is different.¹ We hold with our Articles, that every Church has power to appoint its rites and ceremonies, and that its members are bound (within reasonable limits) to submit to such appointment. The conduct of the early Nonconformists, therefore, in objecting to the observance of days that had been set apart by our Church with the sanction of the Universal Church in all ages, as far as we can find, for religious uses, appears to me peculiarly schismatical. And further we maintain, that every such body has authority in controversies of faith, so far as concerns its own members, and may justly make a re-

¹ It might also probably be fairly maintained, that when such a Council as that which met at Nice (the only one by the way having any pretensions to be called General) gave directions such as were there given respecting the day on which Easter was to be observed, it was expedient and befitting the Christian character, that all the different Churches should acquiesce in such an appointment until a similar authority had authorized an alteration; though nevertheless optional, because different Churches might have different customs in such matters, without any detriment to the peace of the Church, if there had been no ecclesiastical tyrants to make it a cause of dissension. See Soer. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 22. Sozom. Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. c. 19.

ception of what it considers the fundamentals of the faith essential to communion, nay, rather, is bound to do so; and while it allows a latitude of opinion on all other points, may, if it seem necessary for the good of the body at large, silence public disputations even on non-essential points. But this power should not only be cautiously exercised, but by the clear and well-ascertained voice of the whole body, for the obtaining of which (I feel constrained to add) due care has seldom been taken.

We allow, then, that the Church has power to enjoin upon her members the observance of certain decent rites and ceremonies, and that such a power has been given her by God; but we draw a distinction between that which God has enjoined on this head, and that which the Church has enjoined. The latter is not to be put forward as necessary to salvation, nor therefore to membership in the Church Catholic, though he who breaks the unity of the Church on account of such things only, is certainly guilty of the sin of making a needless schism in the body.

With respect, therefore, to the examples here adduced by our opponents, in which the *practice* of the Church is concerned, we may say generally that our appeal to the records of the primitive Church respecting them (where we do so appeal) is not an appeal to the doctrine there delivered, as if the few testimonies we can bring from the ancient Fathers were sufficient evidence of the oral teaching of the Apostles, or of the doctrinal teaching of the Universal Church; but an appeal to them, as showing what was the *practice* of the Church in those times. And this precisely agrees with what Mr. Keble himself has admitted to be Bishop Taylor's view, viz. that "in practical matters, it [*i. e.* tradition] may be verified, but in doctrinal, with the exception of the creed, it cannot,"¹ which entirely overthrows Mr. Keble's system.

We refer to those records, as showing what was the *practice* of the primitive Church; which, on the one hand, may show us what rites or usages mentioned

¹ App. to Serm. p. 71.

in the Scriptures were not then considered to be of general obligation, and, on the other, what were, under ordinary circumstances, considered to be so, and how these latter were carried out ; and further, what rites and usages appeared to the Church, at that early period, to be decent and useful, from which last we may at least infer that such rites and usages are at any rate allowable at all times, and useful where our circumstances appear to be the same with those of the Apostolical Church, and thus obtain from those records, information which, when used with discretion, may be of much service to the Church, and to the various independent local communities of which it is composed, in guiding them in decreeing the rites and ceremonies to be observed by their members.

To proceed to the examples adduced, let us take first the case of rites abrogated, or usages mentioned in Scripture not observed by us.

We are required to show why we do not wash one another's feet in obedience to what our Lord says, John xiii. 12—15 ; a favourite example with the Romanists, as may be seen in Dr. Milner's "End of religious controversy ;" but our opponents should have been a little more careful than to borrow it, for, little as it avails the former, the latter have clearly made a mistake in adducing it, for their doctrine is, that such matters must be grounded upon the *consent* of the primitive Church, and it is notorious that the primitive Churches differed in this matter.

Let us suppose, then, (what we do not admit) that the language of Scripture appeared doubtful as to the nature of this command, that is, doubtful whether instead of being an exhortation to acts of condescension and kindness towards our Christian brethren, to be fulfilled to the letter where the circumstances were the same, as in the case spoken of by the Apostle, (1 Tim. v. 10.) and in the spirit under ALL circumstances, it was to be taken as a command to be fulfilled in the letter as a religious rite, in all times and places, however unsuitable to the customs and habits of the country. Our inquiries, then, are to be directed to

the records of the primitive Church. But first, of what nature is our inquiry? Not what *doctrine* the primitive Church delivered on the subject, but what was its *practice*; and if we had found the practice generally established as a religious rite in the primitive Church, or, on the contrary, generally neglected, this testimony of ecclesiastical *practice* might, in perfect accordance with our views, fairly have determined the matter either way, so that even thus the instance is of no force in the present controversy. But the fact is, that the reference is altogether a mistake, for the practice of the primitive Churches differed in this respect, and, consequently, we are compelled to exercise our own discretion in the matter. Thus in the Church of Milan, the bishop washed the feet of the baptized, *in supposed obedience to this text*, which the Roman Church did not do, on the ground that it was merely an example of humility, and not a religious rite, that was here commended.¹ And Augustine tells us, that many followed the latter course, and that some abrogated the custom altogether where it had been observed; but that others, in order to show that they did not connect it at all with baptism [and so make it a religious rite, having some mystical signification], and yet not altogether give it up, observed it a few days after baptism; and he adds in

¹ Adscendisti de fonte; quid secutum est? . . . summus sacerdos pedes tibi lavit. Quid est istud mysterium? Audisti utique quia Dominus, cum lavisset discipulis aliis pedes, venit ad Petrum. . . . Nisi laveris, inquit, tibi pedes, non habebis mecum partem. Non ignoramus quod Ecclesia Romana hanc consuetudinem non habeat, cujus typum in omnibus sequimur et formam; hanc tamen consuetudinem non habet, ut pedes lavet. Vide ergo, forte propter multitudinem declinavit. Sunt tamen qui dicant et excusare conentur, quia hoc non in mysterio faciendum est, non in baptismo, non in regeneratione; sed quasi hospiti pedes lavandi sint. Aliud est humilitatis, aliud sanctificationis. Denique audi quia mysterium est et sanctificatio; nisi laveris tibi pedes, non habebis mecum partem. Hoc ideo dico, non quod alios reprehendam, sed mea officia ipse commendem. In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam, sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus; ideo quod alibi rectius servatur et nos rectius custodimus. Ipsum sequimur Apostolum Petrum, ipsius inhæremus devotioni. Ad hoc Ecclesia Romana quid respondet? AMBROS. De Sacram. lib. 3. c. 1. ed. Ben. vol. 2. col. 362, 3.

the context some remarks which show how little importance he attached to such matters, and how completely he considered them to be left to the discretion of each Church.¹ It appears, then, that there was much difference of opinion on this subject in the early Church, which, therefore, can be no sure guide to us in the matter. And Augustine, be it observed, evidently thinks that our Lord's own words show that he merely meant to recommend mutual condescension to his followers. So that, I think, our Church may fairly say, with Ambrose, to her Romish or any other adversaries, "*nos homines sensum habemus*," we have got our wits about us, and may surely be allowed to judge for ourselves in such a matter.

The next case is that of the abrogation of the seventh day Sabbath.

We should feel no difficulty in this case, even if we were left to determine it by the records of the primitive Church, because here again is a point of external observance, respecting which we have only to inquire as to the *practice* of the Church. But it is passing strange that we should be told that tradition is necessary to certify us of this, when the Apostle says to the Colossians, "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of *the sabbath days*." (*σαββατων*) (Col. ii. 16.)

And the *practice* of the Church, in the age immediately succeeding the Apostles, confirms what this and other passages of Scripture clearly intimate to us, viz., that the

¹ De lavandis vero pedibus, cum Dominus hoc propter formam humilitatis, propter quam docendam venerat, commendaverit, *sicut ipse consequenter exposuit*, quæsitum est quoniam tempore potissimum res tanta etiam facto doceretur, et illud tempus occurrit quo ipsa commendatio religiosius inhæreret. Sed ne ad ipsum sacramentum baptismi videretur pertinere, multi hoc in consuetudinem recipere noluerunt. Nonnulli etiam de consuetudine auferre non dubitaverunt. Aliqui autem ut hoc et sacratiore tempore commendarent, et a baptismi sacramento distinguerent, vel diem tertium octavarum, quia et ternarius numerus in multis sacramentis maxime excellit, vel etiam ipsum octavum ut hoc facerent elegerunt. AUGUST. Ep. 55. c. 18. Ad Januarium. Tom. 2. col. 141. On such points see Hooker, iii. 10.

Jewish sabbath was not to be observed by Christians. Thus Ignatius tells us, that even the converted Jews “no longer observed sabbaths;”¹ and Tertullian, that the Jewish sabbath was abrogated by the Christian dispensation.² The same thing is intimated to us by Justin Martyr,³ whose words seem clearly to show that the day was not at all observed in his time; and although in the third and fourth centuries, the day appears to have been celebrated by the performance of public worship, which was probably an innovation, and the prelude to that Judaical observance of the day against which the Church found it necessary to protest,⁴ still the practice of the Church was not to abstain from labour on that day, or regard it as in itself a holy day, as we learn among other testimonies from one of the Laodicean canons, in the code of the primitive Church, which directs “that Christians must not Judaize and rest on the sabbath, but work on that day.”⁵

If, then, we were destitute of the testimony we have quoted from Scripture on the subject, the clear evidence we have of the *practice* of the Apostolical Church might suffice; and our argument would in no respect suffer from the admission of that evidence as conclusive. For though the observance of a rite in the primitive Church would not prove it to be of Apostolical ordinance, the general non-observance of a rite in it may certainly be

¹ Οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες, εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἡλθόν, μήκετι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κ. τ. λ. IGNAT. Ep. ad Magnes. § 9. ed. Jacobson.

² TERTULL. Adv. Jud. cc. 2, 3, & 4.

³ JUST. MART. Dial. cum Tryph. § 18. p. 118. ed. Ben. The same conclusion appears to flow from what Pliny says of the Christians of his time, that they were accustomed to meet “*stato die*,” on a set day (Ep. ad Traj.), which seems hardly reconcilable with the idea that both the seventh and first days of the week were so applied. And so when Paul stayed at Troas seven days, there appears to have been a public assembly for worship on one day only, and that “the first day of the week.” (Acts xx. 7.)

⁴ See the Laodicean canon quoted below.

⁵ Οὐ δεῖ χριστιανούς ἰουδαΐζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββατῷ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ, ἡμέρᾳ. Can. Laod. 29. Cod. Univ. Eccl. can. 133. Voelli et Just. Bibl. J. C. Vet. vol. i. p. 52.

taken as a proof that such rite was not prescribed for its observance by the Apostles.

Let us pass on to the case of rites and ordinances observed by us.

The *First* is the doctrine of *infant baptism*.

It will not be denied that we have at least the doctrine of *baptism* clearly enough laid down in the Scriptures.

What we have to inquire, then, is, whether we can also clearly and plainly gather from the Scriptures that *infants* are proper subjects of that rite.

It must be observed, however, that the question does not respect *all* infants indiscriminately, but those only that are born of believing parents, and so in a state different to those of the heathen, (1 Cor. vii. 14,) and are also presented to the Church by sureties, who undertake that they shall be educated in her communion.¹ The question, then, is, whether the Church is right in administering to an infant brought to her under such circumstances, and that cannot, like an adult, offer any obstacle to its reception of spiritual blessings by unbelief, that rite which is a necessary introduction to its admission into the Christian Church, and consequently to its being placed in a position to receive the blessings promised by God exclusively to the members of the Church, and looking to God for his blessing upon it, the Church on her part undertaking to God (on the promise of the child's sureties) that the child shall be taught the terms of his covenant, and be brought up in obedience to it, and be called upon at the age of discretion *personally* to accept and promise obedience to it.

(1) Then we observe, that the command to baptize, and the instances we have in Scripture of the practice, are given in the most general and comprehensive terms.

“Go and teach all nations,” saith our Lord, “baptiz-

¹ Cases may be supposed different from that mentioned above, where we might not be prepared to deny that baptism might be administered, as, for instance, the possible case of an infant losing its unbelieving parents, and coming thereby under the guardianship of Christian relations or friends; but such are *extraordinary* cases, upon which no argument can be built.

ing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. xxviii. 19.) And we find Lydia and "her household," the Philippian gaoler and "*all his*," and "the household" of Stephanas, baptized by the Apostles. (Acts xvi. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 16.)

(2) The language of our Lord on one occasion seems clearly to show that baptism is, *in an ordinary way*, (as was the case with circumcision,) necessary to salvation, for he says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) I will not say, with some of the Romanists, (who, when the subject of tradition is out of sight, can clearly enough see the reference of this and other texts to infants as well as others,¹) that this text shows that baptism is absolutely a *sine qua non* to the salvation of infants, because, as Archbishop Laud intimates, we are not to "bind God to the use and means of that sacrament to which he hath bound us;"² yet surely it follows from it that it would be unjustifiable to exclude all infants from that rite without which ordinarily men "cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Nor can it be said that their tender age must at any rate prevent their suffering from the neglect of this rite, for the case of circumcision shows the contrary. "The uncircumcised man-child . . . shall be cut off from his people? *he hath broken my covenant.*" (Gen. xvii. 14.) If, then, it be the case that baptism has been made ordinarily necessary for an entrance into the kingdom of God, then age, however tender, does not remove that necessity.

(3) Has not Christ himself testified his willingness to receive such among the number of his people? for we read that he was "much displeased" with his disciples for rebuking those that brought infants to him for his blessing, and said to them, "Suffer the little children to

¹ Bellarmine himself, after giving three arguments for pædobaptism from Scripture, adds, "*satis aperte colligatur ex Scripturis.*" De bapt. c. 9.

² Conference with Fisher, p. 36.

come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God and he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them." (Mark x. 14, 16. See, also, Matt. xix. 14; Luke xviii. 16.) With this example, then, before us, we ask with confidence, Would the Church be justifiable in refusing to receive into her communion as subjects for Christ's mercy, by the rite appointed for that purpose, infants brought to her under the circumstances supposed, or rather is she not bound to require of her members that their infants should be thus brought to her to be received by her into her communion, as those whom Christ's example when he was upon earth shows that he is ready to accept and bless ?

(4) If infants are susceptible of the enjoyment of *any* Christian privileges, as of the remission of sins, spiritual grace, &c., and baptism is appointed by our Lord to be observed as a rite introductory to admission into the Christian Church, and the enjoyment of such privileges, then the Church is not only justified in admitting infant baptism, but bound to enjoin the practice upon her members.

Now, for the proof of the first of these points, I refer to the following passages: Jer. i. 5; Ezek. xvi. 20, 21; Luke i. 15.; and also to the admission of Jewish infants, by the rite of circumcision, to the privileges of the Old Testament Covenant, which clearly shows that the tender age of infants does not render them insusceptible of the enjoyment of such privileges. For the proof of the second of these points, viz. that baptism is a rite appointed to be observed as introductory to admission into the Christian Church, and the enjoyment of Christian privileges, I refer to the following passages: Acts ii. 41; Rom. vi. 3, 4; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Col. ii. 12; and especially to the text already quoted, that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.)

These two points, then, being clearly decided by Scrip-

ture in the affirmative, the consequence which follows from them is equally clearly established.¹

Such, then, are the clear, and, as it appears to many, decisive arguments which Scripture affords us in favour of infant baptism. And I will only add, that Hooker considered this doctrine to be a *necessary* deduction out of Scripture,² and that Bishop Taylor, in his last work, expressly rebukes his Romish antagonist for taking the ground which our opponents here maintain on this question.³

And when this doctrine is denied, we, in order to confirm the correctness of our deductions from Scripture, refer to the *practice* of the primitive Church, as showing how they understood the matter. We do not make our appeal here to any *doctrinal statements* of the Fathers, as conclusive evidence of what *doctrinal statements* were delivered orally by the Apostles on the subject. But we refer to their statements of what passed under their own eyes, the daily *practice* of the Church, and hence obtain an argument for the correctness of our interpretation of Scripture on this point.

And in all matters that concern the *practice* of the Church, we obtain from the statements of the early Fathers conclusive evidence as to the observance or non-observance of this or that rite or usage at that time, and therefore evidence sufficient *in such a case* to justify us when following them. And even a justification of the usage is sufficient in infant baptism ; for, be it observed, that, as Bishop Stillingfleet says,—“The main question between us and the Antipædobaptists, is not concerning an absolute and express command for baptizing

¹ We might, I think, add to these an argument derived from the rite of circumcision being administered to infants ; but as our opponents deny almost any correspondence between the rites of circumcision and baptism, I content myself with noticing it here.

² See his Eccl. Pol. bk. i. c. 14.

³ Diss. from Popery, Pt. ii. bk. i. § 3. Works, vol. x. pp. 430, &c., where the bishop has also vindicated the Protestant grounds of faith in various other points.

infants; but whether our blessed Saviour hath not, by a positive precept, so determined the subject of baptism, viz., adult persons professing the faith, that the alteration of the subject, viz., in baptizing infants, be not a deviation from, and perversion of the institution of Christ, in a substantial part of it; or, in short, thus, Whether our Saviour hath so determined the subject of baptism, as to exclude infants. And although the question being thus stated, the proof ought to lie on those who affirm it, yet, taking in ONLY THE HELP OF SCRIPTURE AND REASON, it were no difficult matter to prove directly and evidently, that infants are so far from being excluded baptism by the institution of Christ, that there are as many grounds as are necessary to a matter of that nature, *to prove that the baptizing them is suitable to the institution of Christ, and agreeable to the state of the Church, under the Gospel.* For, if there were any ground to exclude them, it must be either the incapacity of the subject, or some express precept and institution of our Saviour. But neither of these can be supposed to do it." This he proceeds to show at some length, and then adding some evidences to "show how suitable the baptism of infants is to the administration of things under the gospel," he mentions, as one of them, "Had it been contrary to Christ's institution, we should not have had such evidence of its early *practice* in the Church, as we have. And here I acknowledge the use of Apostolical tradition to manifest this to us . . . We grant that the *practice* of the Church, from *Apostolical times*, is a great confirmation that it was never Christ's intention to have infants excluded from baptism."¹ Where we may see that the view we have taken above of the use of patristical tradition in this matter, is precisely that of Bishop Stillingfleet.

The second case is the doctrine of the observance of the Lord's Day.

In this there are three distinct points for consideration. First, that which relates to our assembling on the Lord's

¹ Rational Account, &c. Part 1. c. 4. pp. 106—8.

Day for public worship; Secondly, that which relates to the *necessity* of such an appropriation of the day by all Churches, as a divine institution; and thirdly, that which relates to abstinence from our usual worldly occupations on that day.

In all these, Scripture will be found a sufficient guide. In the second, indeed, it alone can be an *authoritative* guide; and in the third, it will be found practically our *only definite* guide.

First, then, the custom of assembling on the first day of the week for public worship, is clearly mentioned in Scripture as one followed by the Apostles and primitive Christians. Thus, on its first occurrence after our Lord's resurrection, we find the disciples assembled together¹ with the doors shut, for fear of the Jews, (John xx. 19,) at which time our Lord first appeared to them, and gave the Apostles their commission (vv. 19—23); and "*after eight days again his disciples were within,*" and Jesus again vouchsafed his presence to them (v. 26);² that is, in other words, the next time of their assembling together, was on the recurrence of the first day of the week.

Of this custom mention is again clearly made in the Book of the Acts, where the sacred historian writes, we "came unto them to Troas . . . where we abode *seven* days. And upon *the first day of the week*, when the disciples came together to break bread, [*literally*, the disciples *being* met together to break bread], Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow."³

¹ Ουσης ουν οφιας τη ἡμερα ἐκεινη τη μια των σαββατων κ. τ. λ. (John xx. 19.) Of the meaning of the phrase, *τη μια των σαββατων*, there can be no doubt, as it is used by *all the four Evangelists* to represent the day on which our Saviour rose from the dead; sometimes with, and sometimes without, the article; as, for instance, *μιαν σαββατων*, Matt. xxviii. 1. *της μιας σαββατων*, Mark xvi. 2. *τη μια των σαββατων*, Luke xxiv. 1. *τη μια των σαββατων*, John xx. 1.

² Μεθ' ἡμερας οκτω, "*after eight days*;" i. e. (according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, including the day from which the reckoning was made,) the same day in the following week.

³ Ἠλθομεν προς αυτοις εις την Τροαδα, . . . οὐ διετριψαμεν ἡμερας ἑπτα. Ἐν δε τη μια των σαββατων, συνηγμενων των μαθητων του κλασαι αρτον, ὁ Παυλος διελεγετο αυτοις, μελλων ἐξιεαι τη επανριον. Acts xx. 6, 7.

Here, then, we find that St. Paul stayed with these Christians *seven* days; and that during these *seven* days there was *one*, "*the first day of the week*," on which "the disciples being met together to break bread," Paul preached unto them. We hear nothing of any assembly on any other day; and on this the assembly was not, it appears, called together by St. Paul; but *being* met on that day, he took the opportunity of addressing them, and the object for which they were assembled was "to break bread;" that is, confessedly, to celebrate the eucharist, the reception of which was one great object for which the early Christians "came together in the Church;" (See 1 Cor. xi. 17—20) whence the Apostle calls it "coming together to eat." (1 Cor. xi. 33.)

Again, the day is mentioned in Scripture as one on which the alms of the Christians were to be laid by for their poorer brethren. "Concerning the collection for the saints," says St. Paul, "as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him; that there be no gatherings when I come."¹

This shows that the day which the former passages prove to have been used as a day for their assembling together for public worship, was also appointed for the act of charity here mentioned; a further proof of its appropriation to religious purposes generally.

Lastly, we find in the Book of Revelation a day distinguished by the title "the Lord's Day;"² which shows

¹ Κατα μίαν σαββατων ἑκάστος ὅμων παρ' ἑαυτῶ τιθετω, θησαυρίζων ὃ τι ἀν εὐδοῦται, ἵνα μὴ ὅταν ἐλθῶ, τότε λογίαι γινῶνται. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Perhaps a better translation of these words than that in our authorized version would be, "Let every man lay by him *for* (or, *against*) the first day of the week," &c.; that is, for the collection which was then made at the time of their being assembled together for public worship, as we learn from the earliest Christian writers, as we shall see presently. For otherwise, if each man's store was *laid by him*, there must have been a collection when the Apostle came, as much as if this had not been done.

² Ἐγενόμην ἐν Πνεύματι ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Rev. i. 10. We may add here, that the Codex Wechel, reads the passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 2, just referred to, Κατα μίαν σαββατων τὴν Κυριακὴν.

that at the time when the Apocalypse was written, "the Lord's Day" was a day generally known among Christians; and the name itself shows on whose account it was observed, and to whom it was considered sacred. Now this name is invariably applied by the earliest Christian writers to signify the first day of the week, as consecrated to the Lord's service as the day on which he rose from the dead. Thus, for instance, Ignatius is, I believe, universally interpreted as speaking of the Lord's Day in his Epistle to the Magnesians.¹ Melito, Bishop of Sardis, composed a book entitled, "Concerning the Lord's Day."² Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, in his Epistle to the Romans, says, "This day, being the Lord's Day, we have kept holy."³ It is also very evidently spoken of under this title, by Clement of Alexandria.⁴ And by Tertullian expressly; "On the Lord's Day," he says, "we consider it a sin to fast, or to pray kneeling."⁵ The name is also to be found in Cyprian and Origen; but it is unnecessary to trace it further.

From these passages of Scripture, then, it is very clear that on the first day of the week the Apostles and primitive Christians were in the habit of assembling together

¹ Μηκετι σαββατιζοντες αλλα κατα Κυριακην ζωνν ζωντες, εν η και η ζωη ημων ανετειλεν δι' αυτου. IGNAT. Ep. ad. Magnes. § 9.

² Περι Κυριακης. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. 26. Where Eusebius also mentions his having written a work Περι του πασχα, which shows that the former work did not apply to that subject.

³ Την σημερον Κυριακην αγιων ημεραν διηγαγομεν. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. 23.

⁴ The Gnostic, he says, Κυριακην εκεινην την ημεραν ποιει, οτ' αν αποβαλλη φαυλον νοημα και γνωστικον προσλαβη, την εν αυτω του Κυριου αναστασιν δοξαζων. Strom. lib. vii. p. 877. ed. Potter. (Sylb. 744.) We may note also the following passage in the "Excerpta Theodoti" usually printed with the works of Clement,—Η μεν ουν πνευματικων απαυσις εν Κυριακη εν ογδοαδι η Κυριακη ονομαζεται. § 63. p. 984. ed. Potter. (Sylb. p. 798. D.) The passage is evidently somewhat corrupt, but sufficiently clear for our present purpose.

⁵ Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus vel de geniculis adorare. Tertull. De cor. mil. c. 3. p. 102. ed. 1664. The name is also to be found in the "Quæstiones et respons. ad orthod." (q. 115.) attributed to Justin Martyr, in which it is stated that the custom of standing at prayer on Sunday, is said by Irenæus, in his work, Περι του Πασχα, to have been a custom of the Church from the times of the Apostles.

for religious purposes, and of considering the day more or less sacred to Christ, calling it *the Lord's Day*.

And with respect to this matter of fact, if the testimony in Scripture had been less, the records of the primitive Church would have been sufficient to show us its *practice* in this respect, (though not to trace it quite so far back,) and thus to *recommend* the practice to us.

The testimonies we have already adduced, when speaking of the *name* by which this day was known, show its observance by the Church at that period. I will, therefore, here only add one more from Justin Martyr. "Upon the day called Sunday, all, both of those that live in cities, and those that live in the country, meet together in one place; and the gospels of the Apostles,¹ or the writings of the Prophets, are read as time will permit. Then when the reader has ceased, the president² addresses them, by way of admonition and exhortation to the imitation of the excellent things they have heard. Then we all rise up together and pray; and, as I have already said, when we have finished praying, bread is brought, and wine and water; and the president offers, to the best of his ability,³ prayers and thanksgivings; and the people add their voice in consent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution and communication of the Eucharist to each one, and it is sent to those who are not present, through the deacons. But the wealthy, who please, give according to their pleasure, each one what he pleases, of that which belongs to him; and the collection is deposited with the president, and he assists the orphans and widows, and those who, from sickness, or any other cause, are in

¹ Τα απομνημονευματα των Αποστολων, which he elsewhere explains by the words ἡ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια.

² Ὁ προεστως.

³ Ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ. These words have been sometimes considered a proof that the prayers and thanksgivings were extempore; but in the former part of the Apology (§ 13. p. 51.) the same words are used with reference to Christians generally, (ὅση δύναμις αἰνούντες,) and therefore seem rather to refer to the conduct and dispositions of the worshipper, than the words uttered. See further proof in L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices, pp. 207, 8. ed. 1690.

want, and those who are in prison, and foreigners dwelling among us ; and, in a word, bestows his care upon all that are in need. But we all meet together on Sunday, because it is the first day ; that in which God, having produced a change in darkness and matter, made the world ; and that Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead on that day.”¹

Other testimonies might easily be added ; and if any one is inclined to dispute whether this was the *practice* of the Church *at that time*, we refer to these testimonies, without any injury to our argument, as conclusive evidence that it was, and hence draw an important argument for its observance by all Churches to the end of time.

But this is a point on which we must take higher ground, and therefore proceed to—

The second question relating to this subject, namely, that which respects the *necessity* of such an appropriation of the day by all *Churches* as a divine institution.

That it is necessary, we are agreed ; and the proof, as it appears to me, rests upon two grounds, first the practice of the *Apostolical* Church, and, secondly, the sanctification of one day in each seven by God himself, which day the practice of the *Apostolical* Church appears to show was transferred under the Christian dispensation from the seventh to the first, in honour of our Saviour’s resurrection. Both these, then, may be derived from Scripture ; nor could the *necessity* of the practice be established, as it appears to us, but upon Scripture testimony.

First, the practice of the *Apostolical* Church. This, as we have seen, is manifested by Scripture. And the *practice* of the primitive Church shows that they regarded it as of perpetual observance. And I suppose it hardly needs to be argued, that *in such a matter* the *fact* that a

¹ Justin. Mart. Apol. 1. § 67. ed. Bened. pp. 83, 4. See also the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas, § 15, and the well-known letter of Pliny to Trajan.

day was set apart for public worship by *the Church when it included the Apostles*, is quite sufficient of itself to render it incumbent upon all Churches to follow their example.

And we thus place it upon the ground of Apostolical and primitive *practice* (in the absence of an express Apostolical command) in contradistinction to the foundation upon which our opponents would place it, namely, certain patristical statements of what our Lord or his Apostles *orally delivered*, in which we cannot place the same reliance as in those which concern the *practice* of the Church to which they were eye-witnesses. I may observe, also, that I have yet been unable to find one testimony during the whole of the first three centuries, in which it is stated that any such command was delivered by our Lord or his Apostles; nor, as it appears to me, do we need any. I am quite ready to admit, however, that as the testimonies of several Fathers in favour of a doctrine is to a certain extent an argument in favour of it, so may we derive a confirmation of our views respecting the Lord's day, from the statements of several of the Fathers in the fourth and fifth centuries, as Eusebius, Athanasius, Ambrose, &c., that this day was specially commanded to be observed by our Lord and his Apostles. I will only observe, that a more stringent proof with me would be that passage in Clement of Rome, a *contemporary* of the Apostles, where he says that "we ought to do all things in order whatsoever the Lord commanded us to perform, *at the times appointed*, and to be careful that our offerings and public services are performed; and he has commanded these to be done, *not at chance times and without order, but at certain fixed times and seasons*," &c.¹ Which passage, when coupled with the practice of the Apostolical Church, and coming from a *contemporary* of the Apostles, has great weight.

¹ Παντα ταξει ποιειν οφειλομεν, ὅσα ὁ Δεσποτης επιτελειν εκελευσεν κατα καιρους τεταγμενους· τας τε προσφορας και λειτουργιας επιτελεισθαι, και ουκ εικη η ατακτως εκελευσεν γινεσθαι, αλλ' ὀρισμενοις καιροις και ὥραις. Ep. ad. Corinth. i. § 40, ed. Jacobson. vol. i. pp. 136, 138.

But the necessity of the practice is usually placed upon still stronger grounds, viz. the sanctification of one day in each seven by God himself, from the beginning, which day, the practice of the Apostolical Church appears to show, was transferred under the Christian dispensation from the seventh to the first, in honour of our Saviour's resurrection.

It will not, I suppose, be denied, that the sanctification of the seventh day by God himself *from the beginning* must be proved by Scripture authority, or not at all, however it may be *confirmed* from other sources; and if such sanctification be proved, then it seems to follow that when the Apostles, who were guided in such matters by the Spirit of God, abrogated the seventh day Sabbath, and devoted the first day of the week to the purposes of religion, as we have shown from Scripture they did, they *substituted* that first day for the seventh as a day to be sanctified by us.

And without attempting here fully to discuss this point, which would occupy us too long, I shall only refer our opponents to what "the judicious" Hooker says on the subject, which may show them that I have here placed this matter precisely upon the foundation on which he has rested it. "The moral law," he says, "requiring *a seventh part* throughout the age of the whole world to be that way employed, although with us the day be changed in regard of a new revelation begun by our Saviour Christ, yet the same proportion of time continueth which was before, because in reference to the benefit of creation, and now much more of renovation, thereunto added by him, which was Prince of the world to come, we are bound to account the sanctification of one day in seven a duty which God's immutable law doth exact for ever." (Eccl. Pol. bk. v. c. 70.)

And then proceeding to notice other days which ecclesiastical precept and usage had appropriated as festival or sacred days, he justly animadvertes upon the folly of those who thought that the Church had no right to require the

observance of such days, while at the same time he manifestly considers *all* those days to stand upon a very different footing to that which had express Apostolical and divine sanction for its observance. (See *the whole* of c. 71.)

But if we consult the Fathers on this point, we shall find them altogether at variance as to the observance of one day in seven as a holy day *from the beginning*, and three of the earliest and best authorities among them, namely, Justin Martyr,¹ Irenæus,² and Tertullian,³ distinctly maintaining that the Patriarchs before Moses did not observe any such day, which would completely cut away the ground from under us in this argument for the *necessity* of observing the Lord's day, because by such statements they make it merely a Jewish ordinance.

The third point involved in this matter is that which relates to abstinence from our usual worldly occupations on this day.

The proof of this is, I need hardly say, to be found in what we have just been endeavouring to show, namely, that the observance of the first day of the week under the Christian dispensation, corresponds with the observance of the seventh under the Old Testament dispensation, the two days being alike dedicated to the service of God, and *differing* in the precise mode of observance only according as *the dispensations* differed from each other.

But that a *unanimous consent* of Fathers can be shown for this, is a point which I must leave for our opponents to prove. I should have no wish to disturb it if it could be proved, nor have I any inclination to enter here upon any attempt to disprove it, but the passages I have referred to in the note below may be worth considering before any such assertions are ventured respecting it.⁴

¹ Dial. cum Tryph. § 19. p. 119. ed. Ben.

² Adv. hæer. lib. iv. c. 30. ed. Grab.

³ Adv. Jud. cc. 2 and 4.

⁴ For the first three centuries we have unfortunately nothing definite on the point; but after that period there occur passages which, if we pretend to rest the

The next example is,—the perpetual obligation of the eucharist.

Our opponents seem to care but little how they weaken the *Scriptural* foundation for the doctrines and rites of the Christian religion, if only they can force us to a dependence upon their beloved “tradition,” or surely they would never have resorted to such a statement as this. Not to notice our Lord’s command, “Do this *in remembrance of me*,” where the notice of the *object* for which the rite is to be observed is sufficient at once to stamp it as one of perpetual obligation, what I would ask is the meaning of St. Paul’s words that in this rite we “show the Lord’s death *till he come*?” (1 Cor. xi. 26.)

It would be a waste of words, however, to enlarge on such a point.

point in question upon the unanimous consent of the Fathers, will need some skill in interpreting to reconcile them with others. Thus Constantine himself directs,—“Omnes judices, urbanæque plebes, et cunctorum artium officia venerabili die solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturæ libere licenterque inserviant : quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas cælesti provisione concessa.”—Cod. Justin. lib. iii. Tit. 12. De feriis. l. 3. ed. Lips. 1705, vol. ii. col. 194. The direction of the Laodicean council *την κυριακην προτιμωντας, ειγε δυναυτο, σχολαζειν*, (Conc. Laod. can. 29. in Bibl. Justell. p. 52.) may perhaps be reconciled by supposing the words *ειγε δυναυτο* to refer to slaves and persons under the power of another, but this, be it observed, is not the explanation given by Balsamon and Zonaras. The third Council of Orleans decrees, “Quia persuasum est populis die dominico *agrum cum caballis aut bobus et vehiculis itinera non debere*, neque ullam rem ad victum præparare, vel ad nitorem domus vel hominis pertinentem ullatenus exercere, (quæ res ad Judaicam magis quam ad Christianam observantiam pertinere probatur) id statuimus, ut die dominico, quod ante fieri licuit, liceat. De opere tamen rurali, id est, arato, vel vinea, vel sectione, messione, excussione, exarto [exerto] vel sepe censuimus abstinendum, quo facilius ad ecclesiam convenientes orationis gratiæ [gratia] vacent.” (Concil. Aurel. iii. Can. 28. Concil. ed. 1671. vol. v. col. 302.) What can we say, moreover, to the passage of Jerome, where, speaking in praise of Paula and her companions, he says “Die dominico ad ecclesiam procedebant ex cujus habitabant latere. Et unumquodque agmen matrem propriam sequebatur, atque inde pariter revertenes, instabant operi distributo, et vel sibi, vel cæteris indumenta faciebant.” (Hieron. Ep. ad Eustoch. Epitaph. Paulæ matris. Ep. 108. § 19. ed. Vallars. Venet. 1766. vol. i. col. 712.)

And were we to go to the records of the primitive Church to confirm our view of the matter, the appeal, be it observed, would be not to the Fathers as witnesses of what the Apostles *said*, nor to what "the ages immediately succeeding" the Apostles *thought*," respecting it, but merely to the *practice* of the Church.

We are next sent to tradition to assure us of the identity of our mode of consecration in the eucharist with the Apostolical, which Mr. Keble considers to be essential to our receiving any benefit from it. But surely the accounts of this matter given us by the Evangelists and by St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 23, &c.) are sufficient on this head, and if not, I know not how Mr. Keble can prove more to be Apostolical, unless he rests upon Liturgies known to be either spurious, or more or less interpolated, or of too late a date to prove any thing, which he must excuse us from receiving as any certain evidence of the precise mode in which the Apostles acted. But alas ! he seems to think that such evidence is conclusive. For thus he writes ;—"Not to dwell on *disputable* cases . . . where, except in the primitive Liturgies, a main branch of that tradition, can we find *assurance* that in the Holy Eucharist we consecrate as the Apostles did, and *consequently* that the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break the communion of the body of Christ?" (p. 38.) Mr. Keble forgot that he had first to show that such identity in the form used was necessary to assure us of an acceptable celebration of the eucharist. He implies that we cannot be sure, unless we use the same form of words with the Apostles, that our celebration of the eucharist is acceptable to God. I beg to ask, Why not ? He might as well assert that we could not be sure that our prayers were acceptable to God unless we prayed precisely in the same words that the Apostles did. One might suppose he was speaking of some magical incantation. Why any precise form of

words should be necessary it is difficult to conceive, nor, as far as I am aware, can even patristical tradition be pleaded in favour of such necessity.

Tradition is said further to teach us that "consecration by apostolical authority is *essential* to the participation of the eucharist," that is, the elements must be blessed by one ordained by succession from the Apostles. For this Mr. Keble quotes the following passage from Ignatius ;— "Let that eucharist be accounted valid which is under the bishop or some one commissioned by him;"¹ and adds, as follows,— "Wherein he lays down the rule which *we know was universally received in the Primitive Church* [*? how*] that consecration by Apostolical authority is essential to the participation of the eucharist, and so far generally necessary to salvation. Now supposing this could not be at all proved from Scripture, (*as it may, in a great measure, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds,*) still it might be accepted *on the above evidence* as a *necessary* rule of Church communion without infringing on our sixth Article."² He considers, therefore, that no one receives the eucharist, who does not receive it so consecrated. This is given as an instance that a rule may be both Divine and generally necessary to salvation, and yet not be contained in Scripture, and Mr. Keble holds that this view is not opposed to the sixth Article. For the *doctrine* that such consecration is *necessary* he holds that it would be wrong to put into the Creed, because *the knowledge* of this doctrine, he thinks, is not necessary to a right and faithful participation of the eucharist, though clearly according to his view of the matter a man is entirely deprived of the benefits of the eucharist unless he acts as if he had that knowledge, and by this distinction he hopes to escape condemnation by the sixth Article. Now, supposing that a participation of the eucharist is

¹ Ad Smyrn. c. 8.

² Serm. p. 78. Combining this doctrine with what is maintained in Tract 85, p. 51, that the sixth chapter of St. John's gospel refers to the Lord's supper, the members of unepiscopal churches are left altogether without hope.

generally necessary to salvation, I ask, whether, if we teach upon the authority of "tradition," that that eucharist only is valid which is consecrated by one episcopally ordained, and consequently that we must partake of the eucharist so consecrated, we do not teach something as "requisite or necessary to salvation," which "is not read in Holy Scripture, nor may be proved thereby?" and thereby offend against the sixth Article, for the Article not only speaks of what is "to be *believed* as an article of the faith," but *also* that "*whatsoever*" is not so proved is not to be "*thought requisite or necessary to salvation.*" If, then, Mr. Keble wishes not to fall under the condemnation of the sixth Article, he will, I think, find it necessary to fall back upon his Scripture proof, which where he will find, it is difficult to conjecture.

But dismissing the question of the consistency of this statement with the Article, let us proceed to the consideration of the doctrine here maintained. It is asserted that in the absence of all proof from Scripture, the single passage of Ignatius is sufficient to show that it is a necessary rule of Church communion, that is, of communion with the Universal Church, and hence, of course, the Foreign Reformed Churches are excluded from the pale of that communion.

Now, as to the propriety and validity of such consecration, be it remembered, there is no question with any party, nor do we doubt its being, under ordinary circumstances, the *orderly* consecration. The practice of the primitive Church may be taken as a sufficient testimony of that. Indeed, the separation of certain persons as spiritual teachers and leaders of the worship of the people would at once point them out to us as, under all ordinary circumstances, the dispensers of the sacraments. Be it observed, then, that as a point of ecclesiastical *order*, we maintain firmly that, under all ordinary circumstances, the clergy are the only proper dispensers of the sacraments. But as to the *essential necessity* of such consecration, *in all cases and under all circumstances*, that is the

question. If it can be proved from Scripture, as Mr. Keble says, well and good. But against such a doctrine being laid down on the authority of the passage in Ignatius, or half a dozen such passages, we must protest. For, in the first place, Ignatius had a particular case in his eye, and was addressing a Church where purity of doctrine and worship existed, and where, therefore, there was no reason why the performance of the offices of the Church should be taken out of the hands of those who had been separated for that service, and consequently it follows not from these words, that if Ignatius had been addressing the Christians of the West in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, he would have used the same language, or said to them as he did to the Magnesians, Do nothing without your bishops. And secondly, we protest against such a doctrine being laid down on the authority of a few passages of the antient Fathers, even if they did speak of it either as an Apostolical doctrine, or as one universally received in the primitive Church. Nay, further, we must take still higher ground, and call in question the alleged *fact* of its universal reception in the primitive Church, even upon the showing of the records that remain to us.

The truth is that this doctrine is derived from the supposition that the eucharist is a true and proper sacrifice to God, and that the clergy are true and proper priests, alone authorized by God, through ordination by succession from the Apostles, to offer it,—a supposition which I need not say is utterly unsupported by Scripture, for its defenders scarcely venture to claim such support for it, but what is more, one which the records of the Apostolically-primitive Church also repudiate. On these points we shall have occasion to speak more at large presently; but as it respects the point in hand, it is impossible for any ingenuity to get over the passage of Tertullian which Dodwell has vainly attempted to explain away.¹ The passage is as clear as words can make it. Speaking

¹ See his "De jure laicorum sacerdotali."

against second marriages, he says, " We shall be foolish if we suppose that what is not lawful to priests is lawful to laymen. Are not those of us who are laics priests? It is written, ' He hath made us kings and priests to God and his Father.' The authority of the Church has appointed the difference between the Order and the People, and the dignity is sacred, where there is an assembly of the Order, so *where there is no assembly of the ecclesiastical Order you both offer* [*i. e. in the Eucharist*] *and baptize, and are alone a priest to yourself*. Moreover, where there are three, there is a Church, *although they be laymen*. For each one lives by his own faith, nor is there respect of persons with God, since not the hearers of the law, but the doers are justified by God, as the Apostle says. Therefore, if you *have in yourself the rights of a priest where necessity requires it*, it is right that you should also conform to the discipline befitting a priest, where it may be necessary to have the rights of a priest. Do you baptize after a second marriage? Do you offer after a second marriage? How much worse is it for a layman twice married to act as a priest, when the power of acting as a priest is taken away from a priest himself upon contracting a second marriage? But you say it is conceded to the necessity of the case. No necessity is admitted but that which cannot be otherwise. Take care not to be found a digamist, and you do not fall into the necessity of administering that which it is not lawful for a digamist to administer. God would have *all of us* so circumstanced as to be every where ready to *perform his sacraments*."¹

Whatever may be thought of this passage in other respects, one thing is clear, that Tertullian had no notion

¹ Vani erimus, si putaverimus quod sacerdotibus non liceat laicis licere. Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, Regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter Ordinem et Plebem constituit Ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per Ordinis consessum sanctificatus, adeo ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis, et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici. Unusquisque enim sua fide vivit, nec est personarum acceptio apud Deum; quoniam non auditores legis justificantur a Deo sed factores, secundum quod et Apostolus dicit.

that consecration by a bishop or presbyter was *essential* to the participation of the eucharist, but distinctly held that, in their absence, it was quite competent to a layman to celebrate it, which shows that he regarded it merely as a matter of *ecclesiastical order*. For this passage, which had been shamefully falsified in the editions of Pamelius,¹ we are indebted to the honesty of Rigaltius, who gave the passage as he found it, and, in his first edition,² added a note explanatory of the passage, and admitting from it the power of a layman both to baptize and offer the eucharist, in a case of *necessity* such as here contemplated;³ but suffered for his temerity in affixing such a note, being vehemently attacked for it by Albaspinæus, Archbishop of Orleans, in his treatise "On the Eucharist," and others, and afterwards, the matter being carried before the Pope, forced to make his peace for it with Rome in the best way he could;⁴ and for this note are substituted, in his subsequent editions, some evasive words, that have no meaning.

And for such an application of this passage, I have the authority of as learned a witness in such matters as can well be adduced, namely, Bingham, who says, with refer-

Igitur si habes jus sacerdotis in temetipso ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam sacerdotis, ubi necesse sit habere jus sacerdotis. Digamus tinguis? Digamus offers? Quanto magis laico digamo capitale est agere pro sacerdote, quum ipsi sacerdoti digamo facto auferatur agere sacerdotem? Sed necessitati, inquis, indulgetur. Nulla necessitas excusatur quæ potest non esse. Noli denique digamus deprehendi, et non committis in necessitatem administrandi quod non licet digamo. Omnes nos Deus ita vult dispositos esse ut ubique sacramentis ejus obeundis apti simus. TERTULL. De exhort. castit. c. 7. p. 522. ed. 1664. The doctrine that three laymen constitute a Church is repeated in his De Pudicit. c. 21.

¹ See vol. 1. pp. 211, 212.

² Par. 1628. 8vo.

³ See note pp. 137, 8.

⁴ The opinion of Rigaltius was defended by Grotius in his Treatise, "De administratione cœnæ ubi Pastores non sunt." To this Petavius replied in his treatise, "De potestate consecrandi et sacrificandi sacerdotibus a Deo concessa." Salmasius, under the name of Walo Messalinus, followed on the same side as Grotius, in his treatise "De Episcopis," and afterwards Henry Dodwell on the other, in his "De jure laicorum sacerdotali."

ence to this passage, "Tertullian grants no other priesthood to laymen *save that they may baptize in case of absolute necessity, when none of the ecclesiastical order can be had* [and therefore in the same case celebrate the eucharist, for Tertullian's words apply alike to one sacrament as to the other]; WHICH WAS ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH." He adds, in which I cordially agree with him, "But does by no means confound the offices of clergy and laity together, unless any one can think cases ordinary and extraordinary all one."¹

Nor is this passage of Tertullian the only one which shows that at that period there was no such notion entertained as that which our opponents here urge upon us, and even seem to regard as vital. There is a remarkable passage of a similar kind in Justin Martyr, in which he clearly speaks of *all Christians* being priests of God, *as being persons admitted by him to offer acceptable sacrifices* to him, even the sacrifices of prayer and praise, mentioning particularly among the latter that made in *the eucharist of the bread and wine*. These are his words. "*We [Christians] are God's true sacerdotal race, as also God himself testifies, saying that, in every place among the nations they shall offer to him acceptable and pure sacrifices. But God accepts sacrifices from no one but from his priests. God, therefore, having willingly received all of us who, through this name, offer the sacrifices which Jesus Christ has directed to be made, that is in the eucharist of the bread and the cup, which in every place of the earth are made by Christians, witnesses that we are well-pleasing to him;*" and then, a little further on, very clearly shows what he means by "sacrifices" in these words,—"*That, therefore, both prayers and thanksgivings (eucharists) made by THE WORTHY are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God, I also affirm. For these alone Christians have been taught to perform, both for a memorial of their food, both as to meat and drink,*

¹ Antiq. of the Christian Church, bk. i. c. 5, § 4.

and one in which a commemoration is made of the passion which God [the Son] of God suffered for them.”¹

As far, then, as it regards the essentials of the sacrament itself, the eucharist of *pious Christians* [αξιων] is, according to Justin Martyr, an acceptable sacrifice to God. The office of the bishop or presbyter, then, with respect to it is a point not affecting the reality of the sacrament, but one of *ecclesiastical order*, and one therefore, be it remembered, which, in the eyes of Him who has instituted the ministerial office, and who is the God of order, is of no little moment.

Before I conclude this head, I would also point the reader's attention to a remarkable passage on this subject, in the writings of another Romanist, though, it must be admitted, one upon whom Rome appears to have had a very slight hold, though, nevertheless, one of her most learned sons, I mean Erasmus. In a Letter to Cuthbert Tonstall, Bishop of Durham, he says,—“It is evident that in the times of the Apostles there was a communion which *laymen made among themselves*, with the offering of prayer and praise, and that bread, as is probable, they called the body of the Lord, as even in the Holy Scriptures the same word is frequently applied to the sign and the thing signified. . . . Nor do we find any place in the Canonical writings where the Apostles certainly consecrated the body of the Lord, as it is now consecrated on the altar, except one passage in the eleventh chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and nevertheless in

¹ Αρχιερατικον το αληθινον γενος εσμεν του Θεου, ως και αυτος ο Θεος μαρτυρει, ειπων οτι εν παντι τοπω εν τοις εθνεσι θυσιας ευαρεστους αυτω και καθαρως προσφεροντες. Ου δεχεται δε παρ' ουδενος θυσιας ο Θεος, ει μη δια των ιερων αυτου. Παντας ουν οι δια του ονοματος τουτου θυσιας ως παρεδωκεν Ιησους ο Χριστος γινεσθαι, τουτεστιν επι τη ευχαριστια του αρτου και του ποτηριου, τας εν παντι τοπω της γης γινομενας υπο των Χριστιανων, προλαβων ο Θεος, μαρτυρει ευαρεστους υπαρχειν αυτω 'Οτι μεν ουν και ευχαι και ευχαριστιαι υπο των αξιων γινομεναι, τελειαι μοναι και ευαρεστοι εισι τω Θεω θυσιαι, και αυτος φημι ταυτα γαρ μονα και Χριστιανοι παρελαβον ποιειν, και επ' αναμνησει δε της τροφης αυτων ξηρας τε και υγρας, εν η και του παθους ο πεπονθε δι' αυτου [αυτους] ο Θεος του Θεου μεμνηται. JUST. MART. Dial. cum. Tryph. §§ 116, 117. pp. 209, 210, ed. Ben. (pp. 344, 345, ed. Col. 1686.)

the tenth chapter, whence this discourse of Paul had originated, there is apparently no reference to *priestly consecration*.”¹

There can be little doubt, I think, what were the sentiments of Erasmus when he penned this.

I proceed to the remaining points, which relate to the ministerial office and character.

We are told that we are indebted to tradition for the knowledge of—

The separation of the clergy from the people as a distinct order.

What may be the *precise* meaning of this, I am not sure. If it means that the clergy are priests to sacrifice for the people, or that they are so separated from the laity that none of the duties of their office could, under any circumstances, be performed by a layman without sacrilege or profane presumption; then, certainly, Scripture is altogether deficient in such information; and so, as I shall hereafter show, is “tradition” too. Or if it be a matter of *words* and *names*, we may not be able to find it in Scripture. It is necessary, then, in order to give a clear and definitive answer on this point, to know what is the precise claim made for the clergy.

But if the claim be that which alone either Scripture or Fathers will warrant, namely, that they are persons set apart in accordance with the expressed will of our Lord and his Apostles, to minister to mankind in spiritual things, and thus have an office which others, not so set apart, have not, and therefore ought not, under ordinary

¹ Deinde constat temporibus Apostolorum fuisse synaxim, quam laici inter se faciebant adhibita precatone et benedictione, et eum panem (ut est probabile) appellabant corpus Domini: ut frequenter etiam in sacris literis eadem vox signo et rei signatæ accommodatur. . . . Nec usquam in canonicis literis invenitur, ubi Apostoli certo consecraverint corpus Domini, sicut nunc consecratur in altari, excepto uno loco prioris ad Corinthios Epistolæ xi. et tamen in x. capite unde fluxerat hic Pauli sermo, non videtur agi de consecratione sacerdotali. Erasmi. Rot. Ep. Cuthb. Tonstall. Inter Epist. lib. 26. Ep. 59. col. 1478,9. ed. Lond. 1642.

circumstances, to interfere with, then I do not understand how it can be maintained that the distinction between such persons and the general body of Christians is not to be found in Scripture. What is the meaning of the following texts? "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. (Eph. iv. 11—13.) "For this cause," says St. Paul to Titus, "left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain elders in every city*, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, &c," (Tit. i. 5 & seq.) "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and *are over you in the Lord*, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." (1 Thess. v. 12, 13.) "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God, whose faith follow." (Heb. xiii. 7.) "Take heed," says St. Paul to "the elders [or presbyters] of the Church" of Ephesus, "unto yourselves, and to all *the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing *the flock*. Also *of your own selves* shall men arise, speaking perverse things, &c." (Acts xx. 17, 28—30.)

Does not Scripture, then, clearly teach us that there were, from the first, certain men peculiarly set apart by Divine and Apostolical direction, for "the work of the ministry" and direction of the Church? Nay, one of our opponents' own witnesses, Dr. Hammond, will tell them that, as to the distinction between the laity and the clergy, it is *obvious enough* in the sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. For there we find frequent mention, as of

*bishops, priests, and deacons, so also of the brethren and the faithful.*¹

That the distinction, however, was such that laymen were unable, under any circumstances, to perform any of those acts for the performance of which the clergy were set apart, is quite another question; and if our opponents mean to contend for such a distinction as this, then, not only will Scripture, but the Fathers also, fail them in proving it. This I have already shown under a former head, and, therefore, shall here only add what the author of the Commentary on the Ephesians, attributed sometimes to Hilary the Deacon, sometimes to Ambrose, tells us. "It was granted to ALL," he says, "at first, both to preach the gospel, and to baptize, and to interpret the Scriptures in the Church."²

And as it respects, at least, preaching the gospel and interpreting the Scriptures, even in the Church, it is evident from Scripture that, in the Apostolical times, these acts were not unfrequently performed by those who had not been expressly ordained for the purpose. "They that were scattered abroad" after the death of Stephen "went everywhere preaching the gospel." (Acts viii. 4.) "They which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, &c. preaching the word. . . . And some of them spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand

¹ Quod ad rem [i.e. laicorum et clericorum distinctionem] attinet, ea sacris Instrumenti Novi Scriptoribus satis nota est. Imo et voces plane *ισοδυναμουνσαι* et ad illud ipsum quod Ignatius adstruit indicandum destinatae ubique obviae sunt. Ibi enim ut *επισκοπου, πρεσβυτερων, διακονων*, &c., ita et *αδελφων* et *πιστων*, mentionem non semel factam videmus. HAMMOND. Diss. contra Blondell. &c., diss. 2. c. 6. Works vol. 4. Appendix, p. 750.

² Omnibus inter initia concessum est, et evangelizare, et baptizare, et Scripturas in Ecclesia explanare. Comm. in Eph. iv. 11, 12. Inter Ambros. Op. ed. Ben. tom. 2. app. col. 241. I would here remark also that at a meeting of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and a considerable number of the Bishops, in the time of Archbishop Sharp, convened for the purpose of considering the question of the validity or invalidity of lay baptisms, with reference to the dissenters, it was unanimously agreed that such baptisms were, in the view of our Church, valid. See Archbishop Sharp's Life, vol. i. pp. 369 & seq.

of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord." (Acts xi. 19—21.) And St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians clearly forbids none but women to teach in their public assemblies, if only it was done with due attention to order so that there were not two speaking at the same time. (See 1 Cor. xiv. 26—34.) And if this example be objected to, on the ground that the Apostle spoke only of those who had some extraordinary direct illapse of the Spirit upon them, without altogether allowing the force of the objection, I reply that this only shows that such spiritual gifts for the work of the ministry were not confined to those who were especially ordained for it by imposition of hands. Such also was the custom with the Jews in their synagogues. Our blessed Lord was constantly permitted to teach in their synagogues, (see Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35. Luke iv. 15, 31—33, 44. John xviii. 20,) and so were his disciples, (see Acts ix. 20. xiii. 5,) nay invited, for we read that on one occasion, "after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on." (Acts xiii. 15.)

The custom, therefore, was not unlikely to prevail for a time in the early Christian assemblies, though doubtless it was soon found inexpedient, and tending to produce rivalry and confusion.

We are not, however, without instances even of a later date. Such things were not at all apt to alarm the Church, even at a subsequent period, and when occurring under circumstances that certainly made them objectionable; for Eusebius, after telling us that Origen, when he had fled from Alexandria to Cæsarea, was asked by the bishops there to expound the Scriptures in the Church, though not ordained a presbyter, gives us an extract from a letter written by Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, Bishop of Cæsarea, to Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria, who had blamed them for this, in which they say, "What you have added in your letters that it was

never before heard of or done, that *laymen should preach in the presence of bishops*,¹ you have in this *strangely and most widely wandered from the truth*. For where there are found such as are able to profit the brethren, those the holy bishops voluntarily exhort to preach to the people. Thus Euelpis was asked to preach by Neon at Larranda, Paulinus by Celsus at Iconium, Theodorus by Atticus at Synnada, who were our most blessed brethren. And the same thing was probably done elsewhere, although it does not come within our knowledge.”³ Such proceedings, I confess, appear irregular and disorderly, and likely to lead to much evil. Nor can they be reasonably defended on the ground that such lay ministrations were allowed in the Apostolical times, because the circumstances under which they were done were very different when the Church was in her infancy; but our opponents would, I think, do well to consider how strongly these occurrences in the early Church go to disprove their assertion, that for their high-flown notions of the exclusive rights of the clergy in things spiritual they have the universal consent of pure antiquity.

I pass on to the doctrine of,—

The threefold order of the priesthood; another point for which, according to our opponents, we are indebted to tradition.

To see the labours of our great divines who have pointed out the clear and plain authority we have in Scripture for the threefold order of our ministry thus dismissed as unavailing, for the mere purpose of bolstering up the cause of “tradition,” is indeed melancholy. The very ground upon which our greatest theologians have rested the strength of their cause in this matter is thus abandoned, and the constitution of our ministry placed upon a foundation of sand.

To add anything new to the proofs which our divines have so frequently adduced from Scripture on the point

¹ παρόντων επισκοπῶν λαϊκοὺς ομιλεῖν.

³ Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi. 19.

we are now considering I pretend not, but will briefly remind the reader how the case really stands.

For some time after our Lord's ascension, the Church was confined to Jerusalem, and the work of the ministry performed apparently by the Apostles alone. (See Acts ch. i.—v., particularly ii. 42. iv. 35. v. 29, 42.) But "when the number of the disciples was multiplied," (Acts vi. 1.) it was considered by the Apostles, that there were some parts of the ministerial office which might with advantage be delegated to others, and accordingly the order of deacons was appointed for the subordinate duties of the ministry, in order that the Apostles might "give themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word," (Acts vi. 4,) and they were ordained to their office by the imposition of hands by the Apostles. (Acts vi. 6.)

Further, we find that in the Church thus existing at Jerusalem there was also an order of presbyters, sharing with the Apostles themselves the supreme government of the Church, for upon the dispute respecting circumcision, "the apostles and elders [presbyters] came together for to consider of this matter." (Acts xv. 6.) And though it appears that there were others present in such councils besides them, (Acts xv. 22, 23,) yet it is evident that the decisions depended upon the Apostles and elders [presbyters] only, for it is said that Paul and Silas "as they went through the cities delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of *the apostles and elders* [presbyters] that were at Jerusalem." (Acts xvi. 4, see also xxi. 18, 25.) Evidently, then, there were in the Church at Jerusalem three distinct orders, apostles, presbyters, and deacons. Who the presbyters were, or how appointed, or to what office, we have yet to inquire.

Passing on, then, to a subsequent period of the Apostolical history, we find the Apostles "*ordaining* presbyters in every Church," (Acts xiv. 23,) and St. Paul upon passing on one occasion near Ephesus, where a Church had been planted, sends for "the presbyters of the Church," and gives them this exhortation, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost

hath made you overseers [or *bishops*, *ἐπισκοπούς*] to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx. 17, 28.) In what the office of these presbyters, then, consisted, and how they were appointed, we can have no doubt. And we find from this passage, as well as from others to which we shall allude presently, that they then had the name of *bishops*; and I need hardly observe that this in no respect militates against what we are now attempting to prove, because it is not the *name* but the *thing* for which we contend. They were *overseers* of their particular *flocks*, and so are elsewhere said to *preside* (*προιστάσθαι*) over them, (see 1 Thess. v. 12, and 1 Tim. v. 17,) a word which is used also by Justin Martyr with reference to the minister who officiated in the public congregation.¹

But our proof is at present, no doubt, incomplete. Pass we on, therefore, to the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus; and there, particularly in the former, we shall find clear and distinct evidence of that for which we are inquiring. Timothy was then stationed at Ephesus, where the presbyters or bishops were whom St. Paul had addressed as we have seen above; and from this Epistle we learn that besides them (1 Tim. iii. 1 et seq.) there were also *deacons* (iii. 12, et seq.), respecting whom the Apostle gives certain directions; and, with the exception of the directions he gave to Timothy himself, *these are the only ecclesiastical orders or ranks of whom he speaks*; and to Timothy he gives such directions as these;—*"Against a presbyter receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear. I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another; doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands suddenly on no man."* (v. 19—22.) He is to "charge some that they teach no other doctrine" than what the Apostle had taught (i. 3), and the directions of the Apostles as to the

¹ He calls him *the president* ὁ προεστώς in passages already cited above from his first Apology.

character of the presbyters and deacons is given, that he *might know how to act in the Church* (iii. 15). Here, then, is clearly one of an order or rank distinct from that of the presbyters and deacons; a president, or pastor, or, as we *now* call it, bishop of the presbyters and deacons.

In the Epistle to Titus, we read as follows,—“For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain presbyters in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless, &c.; for a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God, &c.” (Tit. i. 5, et seq.) “There are many unruly and vain talkers . . . whose mouths must be stopped . . . Wherefore *rebuke them sharply*” (i. 10—13). “A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject” (iii. 10). Here, then, we find Titus commissioned by the Apostle to perform the same duties at Crete, as Timothy was at Ephesus. And these directions to Timothy and Titus become doubly forcible in proof of the point in question, when we compare them with the language of the Apostle to Churches where no such president appears to have been appointed; as, for instance, the Corinthian, to which the Apostle says,—“the rest will I set in order when I come.” (1 Cor. xi. 34.) And, as it respects the important point of *ordination*, let us observe that the language used in these Epistles, shows that it belonged exclusively to them to ordain; not merely from the charge of ordination being expressly delivered to them alone, but from the power given them over the presbyters, which renders it absurd to suppose that the presbyters there might of themselves appoint others to be presbyters, and thus have the power of introducing any teachers they pleased into the Church.

By what particular name these presidents of the Churches were then known, is a question of comparatively little moment. There is some evidence, however, in favour of their having had the title of Apostles. That several besides the twelve had this title, is clear;¹ and

¹ See Rom. xvi. 7. &c.

the phrase "Apostles of the Churches," (αποστολοι εκκλησιων) occurs in 2 Cor. viii. 23, and not improbably designated those who had been appointed by the Apostles who bore the immediate commission of our Lord, to have the chief superintendence of those Churches; and thus St. Paul, when writing to the Philippians, calls Epaphroditus *their Apostle*.¹ We may observe, therefore, that in this Epistle to the Philippians, we have another remarkable testimony to the position that the clergy then consisted of three orders, corresponding to those which have been received in all episcopal Churches. For this epistle is addressed by the Apostle to the saints at Philippi, "*with the bishops and deacons*," (Phil. i. 1,) which shows that these were the only orders of ministers then present at Philippi; to whom, however, we are to add Epaphroditus, *their Apostle*, who was then with St. Paul, having been sent to him by the Church at Philippi, (Phil. iv. 18,) and who returned to Philippi with St. Paul's letter. (ii. 25, et seq. &c.) In the Book of Revelation we find them spoken of (as we shall see presently) under the name of the *angel* of the Church over which they presided, a name very similar in meaning to that of Apostle; and in the writings immediately succeeding the Apostolical times, we find such persons known by the name of *bishops* of the Churches.

But all with which we are here concerned is, *the office itself*,—and for that, as we have seen, we have, in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, clear and distinct proof.²

¹ Phil. ii. 25. ὅμων ἀποστολον. Our translators have rendered it *messenger*, as in 2 Cor. viii. 23.

² Theodoret states, as a known fact, that "they formerly called the same persons presbyters and bishops; and *those that are now called bishops, they named Apostles*; but afterwards they left the name of the Apostleship to those that were truly Apostles; and gave the name of the episcopate to those who were before called Apostles." Τους αὐτοὺς ἐκαλοῦν ποτὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἐπισκοπούς· τοὺς δὲ νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκοπούς ἀποστόλους ὠνομαζόν· τοῦ δὲ χρόνου προϊόντος, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀποστολῆς ὄνομα τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἀποστόλοις κατέλιπον· τὴν δὲ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς προσηγορίαν τοῖς παλαὶ καλουμένοις ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθεσαν. THEODORET. In Ep. 1. ad Tim. iii. 1. Op. tom. 3. p. 652. ed. Schulz. 1769. It appears to me not improbable that the name Apostle was used only to de-

And besides these three orders, *we read of no others being appointed by the Apostles*; for the other names we meet with, as *prophet*, &c., are not descriptive of persons set apart by the Apostles to fulfil certain duties, but of those who had received an extraordinary gift of the Holy Spirit, such as the name imported. The standing ministry of the Church consisted of the three orders only; but, in the infancy of the Church, it pleased God to qualify many others in a peculiar way to take a part in the work of spiritual instruction. And this may, in a great measure, account for the apparent exercise of parts of the ministerial office by those who did not belong to any of the three orders at this period; and should make others, who are apt to plead their example, somewhat more cautious of an unnecessary interference with the ministerial function.

Having, then, thus found *in Scripture* distinct evidence for the Apostolical institution of these three orders in the ministry, we appeal further to the *practice* of the earliest times of the Church, as testified to us by those who were *eye-witnesses* of it, to give to any who may be unconvinced by the evidence of Scripture, (and however *clear* and *sufficient* it may be, this *may* happen,) additional proof that our views of the matter are correct. But it is upon Scripture that we rely for the proof of the Apostolicity of these three orders. We have no other testimony to the Apostolicity of such matters sufficient to bind the consciences of the whole Church to the necessity of their observance, as our opponents are themselves forced practically to

note those whom the Apostles themselves had appointed to the presidency of the Churches (and not perhaps latterly, i. e. in the latter part of St. John's life, to these;) and that those who succeeded them, not having had Apostolic appointment to their office, contented themselves with a name which had been before either common to all presbyters, or at least applicable to presbyters who had nothing more than an ordinary pastoral charge. The name Apostle, we may observe, is given by Clem. Alex. to Clement of Rome, when quoting his first Epistle to the Corinthians, ὁ ἀποστολὸς Κλημης. Strom. lib. 4. p. 609. ed. Potter. (al. 516.)

admit (as we shall see presently) in some points of a similar nature, which they have themselves abandoned.

The next point for our consideration, is one which has been, in a measure, anticipated in the last; but demands, from its importance, a separate notice, namely,

The government of the Church by bishops.

We have already observed that originally the name bishop was given to the presbyters. But the point in question is not the *name* but the *thing*; i. e. Whether there is Scriptural proof that there were, in the Churches of the Apostolical times, besides the presbyters and deacons, any presidents or superintendents of such Churches, corresponding to what we now call bishops, by whatever name they might then be known; whether *Apostles*, *angels*, or any other title.

The answer to this question, then, may be found under our last head; for we have there shown that Scripture distinctly informs us that Timothy and Titus were such presidents of the Churches of Ephesus and Crete respectively.

And I would here also point the reader's attention to the fact, that the Scripture evidence on this point is so clear, that it has been freely admitted by many of the best divines of the foreign reformed Churches; a fact, which all who wish well to episcopacy, should duly consider before they attempt to deprive their cause of its best support. Thus Abr. Scultetus, commenting on the Epistle to Titus, observes that episcopacy is of divine right because the Apostles set bishops over presbyters;¹ and he acknowledges that this Epistle shows that the power of ordination and the direction of ecclesiastical matters, rests in them.² "We learn hence," says Calvin on Tit. i. 5, "that there was not then an equality among the ministers of the Church, but that one was with authority placed over

¹ See Confessions and Proofs of Protestant Divines that Episcopacy is according to the word of God, &c. Oxf. 1644. 4to. pp. 18, 19.

² In Tit. c. ii.

others."¹ That we have Scripture authority for episcopacy, is also clearly admitted by Luther;² and Isaac Casaubon says, "Bishops, priests, and deacons are founded upon clear testimonies of Scripture." (*Apertis Scripturæ testimoniis.*)³

Further; there is also another portion of Scripture affording equally strong evidence for the point we are now considering, namely, our Lord's Epistles to the seven Churches of Asia in the Book of Revelation, which are addressed to the *angels* of those Churches. True, indeed, it is, that attempts have been made to explain away this evidence, by interpreting the word angel to apply to either the whole Church, or the whole body of pastors in it; or, in short, anything rather than that which it so obviously denotes, namely, some one individual recognized as chief or president of the Church. It is not, surely, without reason, that it may be said *obviously* to denote it, when we find it confessed by so many, whose prejudices would have favoured another interpretation. It is thus interpreted by, among others, Diodate, Theodore Beza, Bullinger, Marlorate, Gualther, Piscator, Paræus, and Peter Martyr.⁴ And Scultetus says, "All the most learned interpreters by angels expound the bishops of the Churches, *nor can it be otherwise interpreted without violence to the text.*"⁵ And Cartwright says,—“The letters written to the Churches were therefore directed to the angel, because he is the meetest man by office by whom the Church may understand the tenor of the letter.”⁶ Our last witness shall be Grotius, who says,—

¹ Confessions, &c. p. 34.

² Si Pontifices et Episcopi desinant Evangelium persequi, &c. . . . parebimus libenter ipsorum autoritati, *quam verbo divino videmus communitam.* Luth. in Hos. ii. 2.

³ Exercit. See “Confessions, &c.” p. 7.

⁴ See “Confessions and Proofs, &c.” pp. 45—47.

⁵ Doctissimi quique interpretes per septem Ecclesiarum angelos interpretantur septem Ecclesiarum episcopos, neque enim aliter possunt, vim nisi facere textui velint. Abr. Scult. Obs. in Tit. In “Confessions, &c.” p. 47.

⁶ On the Rhem. Test. on Apoc. ii. See “Confessions, &c.” p. 47.

“ Our fourth proposition is this, that this episcopacy is approved by Divine law ; or as Bucer says, it seemed good unto the Holy Ghost that one among the presbyters should be charged with a peculiar care. The Divine Apocalypse affords an irrefragable argument for this assertion, for Christ himself commands that a letter should be sent unto the seven angels of the Asian Churches. They who by angels understand the Churches themselves, manifestly contradict the Holy Scriptures, for ‘ the candlesticks are the churches,’ Christ says, ‘ and the stars are the angels of the seven churches.’ It is surprising how far men are carried away by the love of contradicting, when they dare to confound things so clearly distinguished by the Holy Spirit. We do not deny that the name angel may, in a general sense, be applied to every pastor, but here it is manifest that it is used for one in each Church. Was there, then, only one pastor in each city ? By no means. For from the times of St. Paul there were several presbyters appointed at Ephesus to feed the Church of God. Why, then, are the letters sent to one in each Church, if no one had a certain peculiar and eminent function ?”¹

In this portion of Scripture, then, we have a distinct recognition on the part of our Lord himself of the office which we now call the *episcopal* office ; and beyond the mere recognition of such presidents of the Churches by the epistles being addressed to them, we must observe that they are described as *stars* held in his right hand. (Rev. i. 16, 20.)

True, the Churches themselves are so far addressed in these Letters through their presidents, that we cannot draw any decisive argument from them as to the power possessed by these officers, but that they had a general power of superintendence and control cannot of course be questioned, because for what else could they be made presidents of the Churches. But as it respects the duties

¹ Grot. De imper. Summ. Pot. circa sacra, c. 11. pp. 316, 17. ed. Paris. 1647. 12mo.

and powers of such officers, we have sufficient information in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

Let me remind the Tractators of what Hooker has said on this point. "To the Apostles in the beginning, and to the bishops always since, we find *plainly both in Scripture* and in all ecclesiastical records, other ministers of the word and sacraments have been subordinate;"¹ and respecting our Church polity generally, he hesitates not to say against the Nonconformists, "If we did seek to maintain that which most advantageth our own cause, the very best way for us, and the strongest against them, were to hold, even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of Church polity which God hath instituted, and which for that very cause belongeth to all Churches to all times."²

I must add further, however, that when we find that the presbyters were, at Jerusalem, joined with even the Apostles themselves in the Conciliar meetings by which the weightier matters relating to the Church were determined, and that the decrees issued were spoken of as the decrees of "the Apostles and presbyters," (Acts xv. 6. xvi. 4. xxi. 18, 25,) we seem to have in this very sufficient Scripture testimony to the doctrine, abundantly recognized in primitive antiquity, and by the constitution of the Diocesan and Provincial Synods in our own Church, that in such matters the bishops or presidents of the various Churches were not to act alone, but with the advice and consent of the presbytery of their Church. "As the presbyters," says Dean Field, "may do nothing without the bishop, so he may do nothing in matters of greatest moment and consequence without their presence and advice. Whereupon the Council of Carthage (Conc. iv. Can. 23,) voideth all sentences of bishops which the presence of their clergy confirmeth not."³ "With

¹ Eccl. Pol. iii. 11.

² Ib. iii. 10. *fin.* The reason why he does not press this argument is, he tells us, because in such points laws ordained by God himself, and found in Scripture, are mutable.

³ Of the Church, bk. v. c. 27.

the bishop," says Archbishop Usher, speaking of the primitive Church, "who was the chief president, (and therefore stiled by Tertullian, in another place, *De bapt. c. 17. Summus Sacerdos*, for distinction sake,) the rest of the dispensers of the word and sacraments joined in the common government of the Church, and therefore where, in matters of ecclesiastical judicature, Cornelius, bishop of Rome, used the received form of *gathering together the presbytery*, (Cornel. ap. Cypr. ep. 46,) of what persons that did consist Cyprian sufficiently declareth, when he wisheth him to read his Letters 'to the flourishing clergy which there did preside, or rule, with him,' (Cyprian. ep. 55. ad Cornel.); the presence of the clergy being thought to be so requisite in matters of episcopal audience, that in the fourth Council of Carthage it was concluded, 'That the bishop might hear no man's cause without the presence of the clergy, and that otherwise the bishop's sentence should be void, unless it were confirmed by the presence of the clergy, (Conc. Carthag. iv. c. 23,) which we find also to be inserted into the canons of Egbert, (Excerpt. Egbert. c. 43,) who was Archbishop of York in the Saxon times, and afterwards into the body of the Canon law itself. (15. q. 7. cap. *Nullus*.)'"¹ Nay, even with respect to ordination, an act which peculiarly belongs to the office of bishop, as appears by the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, it is *in confesso* that some presbyters ought to join with the bishop in the act of imposition of hands; not, perhaps, as sharing in the very act itself of ordination, but as signifying their assent to the act performed by the bishop. All which shows that the

¹ The Reduction of Episcopacy, &c. ed. by Dr. Bernard, 1656. 8vo. pp. 4, 5. On this subject see also Bingham's *Antiq.* ii. 19. §§ 7, 8. It must be remembered that we are here speaking of the primitive Church. Circumstances may, as in our own Church, have placed a greater distinction between a bishop and a presbyter than what is here recognized, and the episcopate be graced, through the favour of Christian Powers, by a pre-eminence and authority in the State which have materially altered the relative positions of a bishop and presbyter of a Church in many respects, but we are here speaking of the constitution of the Church itself.

government by bishops is not of a strictly monarchical, but of a mixed and limited nature. Not but what their sentence, when accordant with the recognized laws of the Church, may be valid and *sufficient* in the case of *individuals*, but in the promulgation of laws for the observance of their Church, it will, I think, be found that the best testimony is in favour of the doctrine, that they are in such matters to act not *ex suo motu* alone, but with the advice and consent of the presbytery of their Church. This is not, however, the place to enlarge upon this topic, and therefore I will only add here, as a remark pertinent to our present subject, that upon this further question as to the kind and amount of power confided to bishops, Scripture is, as much as on the main question, our only certain guide; for the moment we get beyond the powers clearly conceded to Timothy and Titus, that moment we find antiquity itself divided in opinion.

Upon this point, then, of episcopal government, we conclude with the same remark as in the last case, that having found it clearly and distinctly recognized in Scripture as of Apostolic institution, we refer to the *practice* of the infant Church, as testified by *eye-witnesses* of it, to confirm the correctness of our interpretation of the (as it appears to us) *plain* testimony of Scripture, and to show also (if any still doubt its Apostolic origin) how agreeable such a mode of Church government was to the views of the earliest Christians; and might certainly adduce a mass of evidence sufficient, it might be supposed, to convince the most incredulous and reluctant reader. There are, indeed, some among the patristical testimonies to this point, which afford peculiarly strong evidence on the subject; as, for instance, the testimony of Irenæus to the appointment of Polycarp to be Bishop of Smyrna by the Apostles,¹ a matter of fact coming under his own observation, in which his testimony is entitled to a very different degree of estimation to that which is due to his statement of doctrine orally delivered by the Apos-

¹ Adv. hæ. lib. 3. c. 3. Compare his Ep. ad Florin.

ties, as our opponents will themselves confess, when they recollect his statements of Apostolical teaching respecting the millennium.

I conclude, therefore, that we have Scripture proof, confirmed by the testimony of the primitive Church, that it was an Apostolical institution that the presbyters and deacons of each city or district, with the congregations belonging to them, such districts being larger or smaller according to circumstances, should have a president or bishop placed over them to superintend the affairs of that Church, and ordain ministers as their circumstances might require.

There remains, lastly, for our consideration, the doctrine of—

The Apostolical succession.

On this point we must enter somewhat more fully, as under these words different doctrines may be maintained.

Some of those who are attached to the presbyterian form of Church-government contend for the Apostolical succession of the ministry, but think that it is sufficiently maintained by confining the right of ordination to presbyters; who maintain therefore that individual presbyters may ordain and introduce whom they please into the office of the ministry. This, however, is an extreme which no locally-established Church can *practically* admit, and accordingly we find various limitations placed upon the exercise of this right as we advance from the lowest presbyterian model of Church government to the Churches of Sweden and Norway, where, though the form of government is Episcopal, their bishops were originally consecrated by a presbyter.

The doctrine of the succession, as held by our Church, may be summed up in these two points, (1.) that as the power of ordination and general superintendence of the Church, including the clergy, was committed by the Apostles to the presidents of the Churches, such as Timothy and Titus, only, and was not entrusted to mere presbyters, so this power could only be properly exercised by

those who succeeded such presidents in their presidency, and that consequently all ordinations not performed by such a prelate of the Church are irregular and not according to the rule left with the Church by the Apostles, and therefore under ordinary circumstances inadmissible. And (2), that the only regular mode of admission to the episcopal office is by episcopal consecration.

With such a statement, however, of the doctrine of the Apostolical succession our opponents would be wholly dissatisfied. Running, as we submit, into the opposite extreme to those we have before mentioned, they hold (1) That the episcopal order is so wholly different from that of the presbyters, that the consecration of bishops by bishops is so essential by divine and Apostolical ordinance to render them capable of performing the duties of the episcopal function as to ordination and Church government, and by consequence to the succession of orders of any kind in the Church, that wherever the chain of successional episcopal consecration is lost, there are none duly qualified to preach the word or administer the sacraments, and that those who are not in communion with a ministry so constituted form no part of the Church.¹ (2) That sacramental grace or the grace of the sacraments flows only through ministers who have received such episcopal ordination, and that through them only we can maintain communion with Christ;² and they hold also “the *exclusive* virtue of the sacraments as ordinary means to their respective graces.”³ (3) That by such episcopal ordination is conferred in all cases the gift of the Holy Spirit to abide in the person ordained, “as for all other parts of his office, so for the custody of the good deposit, the fundamentals of doctrine and practice,”⁴ which is called “the

¹ See Tracts 1, 4, 7, 10, 17, 24, 33, 52, 54, 57, 60, 74, and Keble's Sermon. App. pp. 95, et seq., and Pref. to Hooker, pp. li, et seq.

² See, among other passages, Keble's Pref. to Hooker, p. lxxvii, where he speaks of “the necessity of the Apostolical commission to the derivation of sacramental grace, and to our mystical communion with Christ.”

³ Keble's Pref. to Hooker, p. lxxxiv.

⁴ Keble's Sermon. App. p. 105.

doctrine of ministerial grace derived by succession from the Apostles,"¹ or, as elsewhere, the doctrine of "*episcopal grace*."²

The consequence of all which is, that a Christian community in which there is no regular episcopal apostolical succession is no part of the Church of Christ, has no valid sacraments (for though they may exist in name they are not recognized by God, and no grace is given in them); and as the virtue of the sacraments is in ordinary cases held to be the *exclusive* means to their respective graces, and through them only communion with Christ can be maintained, such communities are destitute of any ordinary means of attaining the graces attached to a faithful reception of the sacraments, and of maintaining communion with Christ.

A sufficiently hard case this, certainly, and not to be assigned to any, without very cogent reasons; more especially to a large number of Christian communities, irreproachable in the fundamentals of the faith.

Truly our opponents have well learned the lesson which they have been taught by the monk of Lerins; thinking, I suppose, that one who always guided himself by what "everybody always everywhere" had said must be right, and he certainly felt no hesitation in hurling still more clearly-expressed anathemas. Witness his beautiful and charitable language about the Donatists. "Who," saith he, "is so wicked as to deny, that the Donatists, and such other pests, shall burn for ever with the devil?"³

Alas, that such language should ever have been used respecting any who were sound in the fundamentals of the faith, however erroneous they might be in their views of Church polity. Our opponents will, perhaps, say that such language cannot be attributed to them. Perhaps not; but let them well consider the position in which they place themselves, by asserting that there are those living in the midst of the Church of Christ on earth,

¹ Ib. p. 100.

² Keble's Serm. pp. 43, 44.

³ Vincent. Lirinens. Commonit. c. 6.

who, though they are orthodox in the fundamentals of the faith, and *may* be in a state of salvation, (for this they seem to allow,) are not within the pale of the visible Church; and thus denying the name of Christians to those whom they believe in their hearts that Christ will accept hereafter.

But, in fact, this notion arises from their doctrine (which we shall notice presently) that the ministers of the gospel are sacrificing priests, like the priests of the Old Testament, through whose offering of sacrifice in the Eucharist, the merits of Christ's death are applied to the Church; and that as the tribe of Levi only was selected to offer sacrifice, under the Old Testament, so that such offering, when presented by any other, was an act of profanation, in defiance of God's appointment, so there is a peculiar mode of appointment for the priests of the New Testament, which, if it be transgressed in the least, there no acceptable sacrifice can be presented; and consequently those who are not in communion with priests so appointed, have none to present the sacrifice for them, and no appointed or ordinary way of obtaining an interest in the sacrifice of Christ.

A notion more completely subversive of the doctrine of the gospel of Christ, could hardly be conceived; but I will not here enlarge upon it, because it will shortly come under our notice in a more appropriate place.¹

Reverting, then, to our statement of what we conceive to be the doctrine of the Church of England upon the point now under consideration, I would observe that, as far as that statement goes, I have as little doubt of the orthodoxy of the doctrine there delivered, as my opponents can have, but, as it respects the Scriptural proof of it, I must draw a distinction between the two points of which it con-

¹ I cannot, therefore, understand how Dr. Pusey can give the extracts he has quoted in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford (pp. 163—8.) from Abp. Bramhall, as coinciding with the views of the authors of the Tracts for the Times. Those passages are written upon very different principles to those which the "Tracts" inculcate, as any reader who will take the trouble to ascertain the *system* on both sides, will at once see.

sists. The former appears to me to have been fully proved by the Scriptures already adduced on the two last articles, to which, therefore, I refer the reader ; and this embraces the doctrine of a *ministerial* apostolical succession ; that is, that our Lord intended that there should be a succession of pastors in his Church, to the end of time ; (Eph. iv. 10, 11, &c.) that he appointed the first, and intended that, under all ordinary circumstances, all who followed them should receive their commission from them or their successors;¹ for we find the Apostles not only ordaining others for the work of the ministry, but directing those who had charge of a Church to “commit” what they had learned of the Apostles “to faithful men, who should be able to teach others also.” (2 Tim. ii. 2.) But I admit that, for the latter point, there is not any Scripture proof ; and we shall find here, as in other cases, that as the proof is not to be found in Scripture, so antiquity, also, is divided with respect to it ; and moreover, that though it is the doctrine of our Church, yet that it is held by her with an allowance for those who may differ from her on the point, and not as if the observance of it was requisite by divine command, and essential to the validity of all ordinations ; though, for the preservation of the full *ecclesiastical* regularity of her own orders, she has made it essential to the ministers of her own communion.

I do not mean, by this, that Scripture will enable us only to prove the apostolicity of a *mere* ministerial succession ; because, as I have already shown, it proves that the office of a bishop or president in each Church, for the purpose of ordination and general Church government, was of Apostolical institution ; but that it does not show that episcopal consecration is a *sine qua non* to the valid exercise of the duties of the presidential or episcopal office. In other words, if in any Church a presbyter be appointed by his co-presbyters to be the bishop, or superintendent, or president of that Church, and perform the usual duties of

¹ In such observations, therefore, as occur in Tract 4. p. 7. and in Tract 17, I fully concur.

the episcopal function, we cannot prove either by Scripture, or by the consent of the Apostolically-primitive Church, that his acts are *by Apostolical ordinance* invalid. That they are invalid by early ecclesiastical ordinance, I readily admit; just as by the Canons of Nice, and other Councils, the acts of bishops consecrated without the consent of the Metropolitan, or under other circumstances of what was then considered irregularity, might be invalid; and, moreover, that nothing but an extreme case is a sufficient justification for a departure from those rules of Church government which have been received for centuries in the Universal Church. But there is a wide distinction between the two cases.

That the Apostles appointed the first bishops in most of the principal Churches of the primitive Church, there can be little doubt; but the question here is, was it a *sine qua non* to the successors of such bishops, that they should receive episcopal consecration; or was it sufficient that a presbyter should be appointed by consent in each Church, out of their own body, to the vacant office? although, as the Church became more settled, it was held to be convenient and befitting that the person so appointed should always receive episcopal consecration; and therefore it was ordained, that such episcopal consecration should be held to be necessary to the valid performance of the duties of the office.¹

In a word, supposing the Apostles to have appointed the first bishops in twelve Churches, I want to know

¹ And for the sake of greater solemnity, it was ordered that such consecration should be performed by *three* bishops. But this is certainly a mere ecclesiastical ordinance, and not necessary. See Jewel's Def. of Apol. Pt. 2. c. 5. div. 1. and Mason's Vind. &c., and Bingham's Christian Antiq. ii. 11. § 5, 6., and Cave's Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, § 6., and Bishop Lucy's Treatise on the nature of a minister, pp. 246, et seq. And Eusebius says, *Κλημης Ευαριστω παραδους την λειτουργιαν αναλνει τον βιον*. Eccl. H. iii. 34. And here I would advise our opponents to take heed how they make the observance of such ecclesiastical ordinances essential, for they will thus leave no succession in existence in any Church in the present day.

where we are informed that when the bishop of one of them died, the Church of the deceased bishop depended upon the will and pleasure of the remaining eleven bishops for a president, and could not appoint and create, to all intents and purposes, its own president, out of its own body of presbyters.

It may be said, that none of the presbyters had received, in his ordination, the power to confer orders; which, to a certain extent, is true; because his ordination did not give him that *office* in the Church, to which the power of giving orders was reserved; but that it did not give him power to do all such acts, when appointed to an office in which he might lawfully perform them, does not appear. A presbyter curate did not receive, in his ordination, power to act as the rector of the Church where he is curate; but it does not follow that when he is lawfully appointed rector, he needs another ordination to perform the duties of that office. The question is not whether every presbyter may ordain, but whether a presbyter, placed in a particular situation in the Church of which he is a presbyter, may ordain.

But now, putting aside for a moment the question of ordination, should we not grant that, as it respects the supervision of the clergy and the Church, the Council of Presbyters would have power to appoint one of their number to such an office? The case seems only analogous to that of bishops and archbishops; where, by human ordinance, for the benefit of the Church, a superiority is granted to archbishops over bishops. But no such power was given to a presbyter at his ordination. Consequently there is a power which can be legitimately conferred by the presbytery of a Church; and then there remains only the question, whether the power of ordination may be included in the grant so made. And it must be remembered that, in such a case, a bishop so appointed, undertakes to confer nothing but what he has himself received, i. e. the full sacerdotal character and office. And if it be

further objected, that he ought not only to have received this from the Apostles, but also the power to confer it, I reply that this seems to prove too much ; for if presbyters cannot, *on this account*, under any circumstances ordain presbyters, neither can bishops ordain bishops ; for though in their consecration power is given them to ordain, there is no notice of any power to confer upon others the power of ordination. And Jerome, speaking on a similar subject, that is, as to the power of baptizing, observes, that the reason why neither the presbyter nor deacon may baptize, without the bishop's leave, is only the preservation of ecclesiastical order ; for that, as to baptizing, it was frequently, if necessity required it, lawful for laymen to baptize ; *for what any one has received, that he can also give.*¹

The question, then, recurs whether *originally* and *essentially* the Church of the deceased bishop had not as much right to confer the power of ordination for its own body, upon one of its presbyters, as the remaining eleven bishops had to interfere in the concerns of another Church, and consecrate whom they pleased (for it would come to that) as its president, and give to him the power of ordination. And before we can assert this, we must first prove that the Apostles not only appointed bishops in these Churches, but that these bishops had power in other Churches also ; and further, not only that the Apostles gave them the power of conferring ordination, but also the power of giving to others the power of conferring it, and limited it to them ; which, I suspect, will be a hard task. Our opponents have forgotten this, when they point us so triumphantly to the lists in Irenæus and elsewhere, of the succession of bishops in various Apostolical Churches, from the time of the Apostles. This is less than half of what they have got to prove ; and shows

¹ Quod [i. e. jus baptizandi] frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis. *Ut enim accipit quis, ita et dare potest.* Hieron. adv. Lucifer. § 9. Tom. 2. col. 182. ed. Vall. Venet. See also Tertull. De bapt. c. 18.

how little they have acquainted themselves with the real difficulties of the subject.

This is a question which, if it had never been mooted, and had no important practical bearings, I would not have brought under discussion ; but, in the present state of the Church, it is one which is forced upon our attention. When we find many important ecclesiastical communities answering it in the negative, we are bound seriously to consider it.

That episcopal consecration was *generally* appointed in very early times to be, as it were, the seal to the episcopal appointment, can hardly, I think, be questioned by any one who is at all versed in the records of the primitive Church ; but, nevertheless, there are testimonies occurring which seem to show, not merely that it was not absolutely essential, but that it was not universally practised.

For instance, the testimony of Eutychius of Alexandria is plain that such was not the case originally at Alexandria. His words are these. After mentioning that Mark the Evangelist went and preached at Alexandria, and appointed Hananias the first patriarch there, he adds, "Moreover he appointed twelve presbyters with Hananias, who were to remain with the Patriarch, so that when the Patriarchate was vacant they might elect one of the twelve presbyters upon whose head the other eleven might place their hands and bless him [or, invoke a blessing upon him] and create him Patriarch, and then choose some excellent man and appoint him presbyter with themselves in the place of him who was thus made Patriarch, that thus there might always be twelve. Nor did this custom respecting the presbyters, namely, that they should create their Patriarchs from the twelve presbyters, cease at Alexandria until the times of Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was of the number of the 318 [bishops at Nice.] But he forbade the presbyters to create the Patriarch for the future, and decreed that when the Patriarch was dead, the bishops should meet together

and ordain the Patriarch. Moreover he decreed that on a vacancy of the Patriarchate they should elect, either from any part of the country, or from those twelve presbyters, or others, as circumstances might prescribe, some excellent man and create him Patriarch. And thus that antient custom by which the Patriarch used to be created by the presbyters disappeared, and in its place succeeded the ordinance for the creation of the Patriarch by the bishops.”¹

I have given this passage in full, because it has been sometimes replied that it referred only to the *election* of the Patriarch, and that we must suppose that he was afterwards consecrated to his office by bishops. But it is evident to any one who takes the whole passage together, that such an explanation is altogether inadmissible; and moreover, the very same word (which, following Selden, we have translated *created*) is used with respect to the act of the presbyters, as is afterwards used with respect to the act of the bishops in the appointment.²

I am quite aware that very considerable learning has been employed in the attempt to explain away this passage, and the reader who wishes to see how a plain state-

¹ The following is Selden's translation of the passage from the Arabic:—*Constituit item Marcus Evangelista duodecim Presbyteros cum Hanania, qui nempe manerent cum Patriarcha, adeo ut cum vacaret Patriarchatus, eligerent unum e duodecim Presbyteris cujus capiti reliqui undecim manus imponerent eumque benedicerent et Patriarcham eum crearent, et dein virum aliquem insignem eligerent eumque Presbyterum secum constituerent loco ejus qui sic factus est Patriarcha, ut ita semper extarent duodecim. Neque desiit Alexandria institutum hoc de Presbyteris, ut scilicet Patriarchas crearent ex Presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri Patriarchæ Alexandrini qui fuit ex numero illo cccxviii. Is autem vetuit ne deinceps Patriarcham Presbyteri crearent. Et decrevit ut mortuo Patriarcha convenirent Episcopi qui Patriarcham ordinarent. Decrevit item ut, vacante Patriarchatu, eligerent sive ex quacunque regione, sive ex duodecim illis Presbyteris, sive aliis, ut res ferebat, virum aliquem eximium, eumque Patriarcham crearent. Atque ita evanuit institutum illud antiquius, quo creari solitus a Presbyteris Patriarcha, et successit in locum ejus decretum de Patriarcha ab Episcopis creando.” Eutych. Patr. Alex. Ecclesiæ suæ orig. Ed. J. Selden. Lond. 1642. 4to. pp. 29—31.*

² See Selden's note in his Commentary on Eutych. p. 63.

ment may thus be darkened may refer to the works mentioned below.¹ On one of those works, however, written by the learned Renaudot, I must offer a remark. Renaudot admits that George Elmacinus in the first part of his *Annals* gives the same account of the matter as Eutychius.² And though he quarrels with both of them for making such a statement, which shows what he thought was the plain meaning of it, he endeavours to show that Eutychius was only speaking of the election, not of the ordination, of the Patriarch, and accordingly (following Echellensis) states that the Arabic word which Selden has translated *laid hands on*, refers only to the holding up of the hand at the election, and that *had Selden understood Arabic he could not have thus translated it*. This is in p. 10. At p. 55, stumbling upon a passage from Severus, where the former translation suited his views, or was so evidently the sense of the passage that he could not otherwise translate it, he blames Echellensis and Morinus for translating it in the latter way, and affirms it to mean ordination by imposition of hands. This surely betrays rather a bad cause; and in fact the meaning of the passage does not wholly depend upon that one word. The word *created* is still more decisive. Moreover, this passage of Severus is worth noticing as giving a very similar account of the election of *one* of the Patriarchs to that of Eutychius. He says, according to Renaudot himself, that after the death of Theonas, "the priests and people were collected together at Alexandria, and laid their hands upon Peter, his son in the faith and disciple, a priest, and placed him in the Patriarchal throne of Alexandria, according to the command of Theonas, in the tenth year of the Emperor Diocletian."³ Here Renaudot contends that

¹ See Abr. Echell. Eutychius Vindicatus, Morinus De ordinat., Renaudot. Hist. Patriarch. Alex.

² Hist. Patr. Alex. p. 10. This portion of Elmacinus is yet, I believe, unpublished.

³ Congregatos fuisse Alexandriae sacerdotes et plebem, *manusque imposuisse* super Petrum, filium ejus spiritualem et discipulum, sacerdotem, eumque col-

the word refers to imposition of hands, but that because *the people* are mentioned with the priests, who never shared in such an office, therefore the words, *they laid their hands on him*, must mean, *hands were laid upon him*,¹ and the presence of bishops to do this is most conveniently taken for granted, though no notice is taken of their presence. I leave this to the common sense of the reader.

But, what is of more importance, this statement of Eutychius is supported by the testimony of Jerome, in a passage where he plainly maintains the doctrine that such an appointment is sufficient to constitute a presbyter a bishop, and adduces this example in proof of it. After having quoted several passages of Scripture to show that a presbyter and a bishop are, as to their sacerdotal character, the same,² he adds, “ But that afterwards one was chosen to be over the rest; this was done to prevent schism, lest each one drawing the Church of Christ after him should break it up. For at Alexandria, also, from Mark the Evangelist to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always called one elected from among themselves, and placed in a higher rank, their bishop; just as an army may constitute its general, or deacons may elect one of themselves, whom they know to be diligent, and call him archdeacon. For what does a bishop do, with the exception of ordination, which a presbyter may not do?”³

This passage, be it observed, does not take away from

locasse in solio Patriarchali Alexandrino juxta Theonæ mandatum, anno decimo Diocletiani Imperatoris. Renaud. Hist. Patr. Alex. p. 54. The extract is from a MS. work of Severus, De vit. et reb. gest. Patr. Alex.

¹ *Imposuerunt illi manus*, idem esse ac, *impositæ sunt illi manus*. p. 55.

² *Eundem esse episcopum atque presbyterum*.

³ *Quod autem postea unus electus est qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est; ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumperet. Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant: quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint et archidiaconum vocent. Quid enim facit excepta ordinatione episcopus quod presbyter non faciat?* HIERON. Ep. ad Evang. Ep. 146. Op. ed. 1766. tom. 1. col. 1082.

the episcopate its peculiar rights, but distinctly admits that ordination belongs to that office, and that its possessor has a higher rank than the presbyter; but at the same time it clearly maintains that, as it respects the sacerdotal character, there is no difference between a presbyter and a bishop, the difference being only to be found in the ecclesiastical distribution of *the duties to be performed by them*, and what is still more to our purpose, that *appointment to the episcopal office by the presbyters of a Church is sufficient* (as far as ESSENTIALS are concerned) *to entitle a presbyter to perform the duties of the episcopal function.*

Now these two positions are perfectly consistent with each other. We may maintain fully even the apostolicity of the Episcopal form of Church government, and yet deny that episcopal consecration is a *sine qua non* to the performance of the duties of the bishop or president of a Church. And if we bear this in mind, we shall find that Jerome, notwithstanding the charges of selfcontradiction that have been brought against him, is perfectly consistent in what he has written on this subject. The great point with Jerome manifestly is, that such a president of the Church should be appointed, and such powers conceded to him, and, in his view, when that is done the essentials are safe.¹

I will add one more testimony on this matter. The author of the Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, attributed to Ambrose, and by others to Hilary the Deacon, says,—“The Apostle calls Timothy, created by him *a presbyter*,² a bishop, (for the first presbyters were called

¹ See his tract, Adv. Lucifer. § 9. tom. ii. col. 182.

² Timothy is here said, we may observe, to have been ordained *a presbyter*. And I cannot but think that the passage, 1 Tim. iv. 14, is favourable to this view. For without adopting the translation which some have given of the passage, viz. “with the laying on of hands for the office of a presbyter,” if we retain our own version, which appears to me more natural, who or what is “*the presbytery*”? Certainly not consisting altogether of Apostles, though it appears, from 2 Tim. i. 6, that ordination was received by Timothy partly from St. Paul. But if presbyters joined in that ordination, it could not be to

bishops,) that when he departed *the one that came next might succeed him*. Moreover, in Egypt the presbyters confirm, if a bishop is not present.¹ But because the presbyters that followed began to be found unworthy to hold the primacy, the custom was altered, the Council foreseeing that not order but merit ought to make a bishop, and that he should be appointed by the judgment of many priests, lest an unworthy person should rashly usurp the office, and be a scandal to many.²

These passages, then, clearly contradict the notion of our opponents as to the *essential* necessity by Apostolical ordinance of the successional episcopal consecration of all bishops.³

Before we pass on, it may be well to offer a remark on a point which the passage we have just quoted from Jerome has brought under our notice, the consideration

a higher *sacerdotal* grade or order than that of the presbyterhood. Nor is this inconsistent with his being called elsewhere an Apostle, which name might be given him as one appointed to be a superintendent of a Church.

¹ The author of the "Quæstiones in Vet. et Nov. Test." which have been ascribed to Augustine, but are probably not his, says, "In Alexandria, and through the whole of Egypt, if there is no bishop, a presbyter *consecrates*." (In Alexandria et per totam Ægyptum si desit episcopus consecrat presbyter.) Where, however, one MS. reads, *confirms* (consignat.) See Aug. Op. tom. iii. App. col. 93. On this subject the 13th canon of the Council of Ancyra (in the Code of the Universal Church) is also worth notice.

² Timotheum presbyterum a se creatum episcopum vocat, quia primi presbyteri episcopi appellabantur, ut recedente eo sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignant si præsens non sit episcopus. Sed quia cæperunt sequentes presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente Concilio, ut non ordo sed meritum crearet episcopum multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum ne indignus temere usurparet et esset multis scandalum. Comment. in Eph. iv. 11, 12. Inter Op. Ambros. ed. Ben. tom. ii. app. col. 241, 2. The "*Council*" may, I suppose, be what Tertullian calls "*consensus ordinis*."

³ There are, also, indirect confirmatory proofs. Such, I think, is afforded by the account we have in Eusebius (vi. 29,) of the appointment of Fabianus to the bishopric of Rome, for the assembly that met to elect a bishop having fixed upon him, *placed him at once on the episcopal throne* (αμελλητως ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λαβόντας αὐτὸν ἐπιθεῖναι,) which seems to me irreconcilable with the notion of the essential necessity of episcopal consecration to have entitled him to the episcopal seat, for he was installed in it without any such consecration.

of which may tend to remove a difficulty that might arise on this subject, namely, the parity of the *sacerdotal* character in presbyters and bishops.

We have a stream of testimonies coming down to us from very early times, that the full sacerdotal power is possessed by every presbyter, and that a presbyter and bishop differ only as to the works of service to be performed, the mere presbyter not being permitted to pass to others that which he has received in ordination, because such promiscuous ordination would be injurious to the Church, and consequently, that where that difficulty is removed by an appointment to the episcopal office by his Church, there all difficulty is removed from a presbyter so appointed freely passing to others what he has received.

But I will here notice one or two testimonies on this point, in addition to that already observed in Jerome.¹

Thus, then, speaks Chrysostom, on 1 Tim. c. iii.: "Having spoken concerning bishops . . . and passed over the order of presbyters, he went at once to the deacons. Why? Because there is not much difference between them and bishops. For they also themselves have received the office of teachers and rulers of the Church. And what he has said respecting bishops, that is suitable also to presbyters. For bishops are superior in ordination only, and in this respect alone seem to excel presbyters."² To the same effect Augustine,—“As it respects names of honour, which the custom of the Church has caused to be observed, the episcopate is greater than the presbyterate.”³ The author of the “Questions on

¹ Another similar passage occurs in Jerome, in his Comment. in Ep. ad Tit. c. 1.

² Διαλεγόμενος περί επισκοπῶν . . . και το των πρεσβυτερων ταγμα αφεις, εις τους διακονους μετεπηδησε. Τι δηποτε; οτι ου πολυ μεσον αυτων και των επισκοπων. Και γαρ και αυτοι διδασκαλιαν εισιν αναδεδεγμενοι και προστασιαν της εκκλησιας και ἅ περι επισκοπων ειπε, ταυτα και πρεσβυτεροις αρμοττει. Τη γαρ χειροτονια μονη υπερβεβηκασι, και τουτω μονον δοκουσι πλεονεκτειν τους πρεσβυτερους. Chrysost. In 1 Tim. iii. hom. 11. tom. xi. p. 604.

³ Secundum honorum vocabula quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit episcopatus presbyterio major. Aug. Ep. ad Hieron. Ep. 82. (ul. 19.) § 33. Op. tom. ii. col. 202.

the Old and New Testament," also, says,—“What is a bishop but the chief presbyter, or highest priest?”¹ And lastly, the author of the Commentary on 1 Tim., attributed to Ambrose,—“After the bishop the Apostle has subjoined the ordination [order] of the deaconship. Why, but that the ordination [order] of a bishop and presbyter is one and the same. For each is a priest, but the bishop is chief; so that every bishop is a presbyter, but not every presbyter a bishop; for he is bishop who is *chief among the presbyters*. Moreover, he notices that Timothy was *ordained a presbyter, but inasmuch as he had no other above him, he was a bishop.*”²

There is also a passage of Irenæus, which, though speaking less *directly* on the point in question, bears an indirect testimony remarkably strong. “We ought,” he says, “to obey those *presbyters* who are in the Church, those, I mean, who have succession from the Apostles, as we have shown, who, with the succession of *the episcopate*, have received, according to the good pleasure of the Father, the sure gift of truth But they who are looked upon by many as *presbyters*, but serve their own pleasures . . . and are elated with pride at *their exaltation to the chief seat* . . shall be reproved by the Word . . . From all such it behoves us to stand aloof, and to cleave to those who, *as I have said before*, both retain the doctrine of the Apostles, and, with THE ORDER OF THE PRESBYTERSHIP, [or, as Fevardentius reads, *of a presbyter*] exhibit soundness in word, and a blameless conversation.”³

¹ Quid est episcopus nisi primus presbyter, hoc est, summus sacerdos? Quæst. in V. et N. Test. q. 101. Inter Aug. Op. tom. iii. app. col. 93.

² Post episcopum diaconatus ordinationem subjecit. Quare nisi quia episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est? Uterque enim sacerdos est, sed episcopus primus est; ut omnis episcopus presbyter sit, non tamen omnis presbyter episcopus; hic enim episcopus est qui inter presbyteros primus est. Denique Timotheum presbyterum ordinatum significat, sed quia ante se alterum non habebat episcopus erat. Comment. in 1 Tim. iii. 8. Inter Ambros. Op. tom. ii. app. col. 295.

³ See the original of this passage, in pp. 125, 6, below.

This passage appears to me decisive as to Irenæus's view of the matter. And we may observe, that elsewhere he calls bishops presbyters.¹

Hence, then, we may observe, that it is not a mere dispute about words, whether bishops are, *properly speaking*, of a different order to presbyters, because, however much the words order, degree, &c. may often be promiscuously applied, without distinction, to bishops, priests, and deacons, so that we may find them called three orders, three degrees, three offices, &c.; yet this is no proof that there is not a sense of the word *order*, in which it may be justly maintained that presbyters and bishops are of the same order, and that the maintenance of such a position is of importance, and has practical consequences connected with it. We do not contend for the word, but for what that word implies; and we understand such language to imply precisely what Jerome means, when he says, that a presbyter and a bishop are the same, which he would not have said of a presbyter and a deacon; and the use of such language shows that there is supposed to be no superiority of *sacerdotal* character in the bishop above the presbyter.

He, then, who holds the two to be of the same order, can hardly hold that by episcopal consecration any new or higher sacerdotal power is conferred. It is a solemn setting apart of a presbyter to the fulfilment of certain duties, which as a mere presbyter he was not allowed by the Church to perform, but which his appointment to the presidency of his Church gives him a right to perform. And that it is not necessary to suppose that imposition of hands in the consecration necessarily implies the impression of any new character, or the donation of a higher sacerdotal grade, is evident from the case of Paul and Barnabas, when certain prophets and teachers of An-

¹ As in his Epistle to Victor, Bishop of Rome. 'Οι προ Σωτηρος πρεσβυτεροι οί προσταντες της εκκλησίας ής νυν αφήγη, Ανικητον λεγομεν, και Πιον, Υγιον τε κ. τ. λ. Op. ed. Grab. pp. 465, 6, or Euseb. Hist. Eccl. v. 24.

tioch, by the direction of the Holy Ghost, "*laid* their hands on them," as a mode of appointment to the office of fulfilling a particular mission, but not surely as giving them any sacerdotal character or ministerial capacity which they did not possess before.¹ And if bishops had been so completely a different order to presbyters as some would have us suppose, surely the name given to them would not have been one which had before been given to mere presbyters.

Hence, a bishop has not improperly been called *presbyter cum additamento superioritatis quoad regimen ecclesiæ*, a presbyter with an addition of superiority with regard to the government of the Church.

The question, therefore, is, whether, when the sacerdotal character has been derived from the Apostles, this addition of superiority with respect to the government of a Church may not be conferred by the *consensus ordinis* of that Church.

Granting, then, or rather maintaining, the superiority of the episcopal office in several respects, and that the episcopal office is an Apostolical ordinance, and that the bishops of the Churches are the successors of the Apostles in the highest parts of the *ordinary* ecclesiastical functions of the Apostles, that is, ordination and supervision of the inferior clergy and the Church,² and therefore widely dissenting from the statements of Aerius, (the question being rather concerning the source of their superior power than concerning the superiority itself;)

¹ See Acts xiii. 1—3; and xiv. 26, 27.

² To succeed them is, after them, to have that episcopal kind of power which was first given to them . . . In some things every presbyter, in some things only bishops, in some things neither the one nor the other, are the Apostles' successors . . . the Apostles have now their successors upon earth, their true successors, if not in the largeness, surely in the kind of that episcopal function whereby they had power to sit as spiritual ordinary judges, both over laity and over clergy, where Churches Christian were established. Hooker's Eccl. Pol. vii. 4.

yet nevertheless, if we are forced to admit (as the passages above quoted seem to me to oblige us to do) that the appointment of a presbyter to that office by his co-presbyters, is an appointment sufficiently valid to give validity to his acts, or that episcopal consecration is not a *sine qua non* in the case, then we must admit that the platform of government in such ecclesiastical communities as the foreign reformed Churches, though not altogether coming up to the Apostolical model, is yet not sufficiently dissimilar to make *their ministry invalid*.

And I confess that it appears to me that this is the only way in which we can fully vindicate the validity of the orders of those Churches. For if by Apostolical ordinance all ordinations performed by any but bishops consecrated by episcopal succession from the Apostles are invalid, then how can we reckon those as validly ordained who, under any circumstances, are not so ordained? I am not sure that even the case of *necessity* could be fully made out for those Churches in what they did, and certainly it did not last long. If, however, the view we have taken of the matter be correct, then the circumstances of the case rendered their conduct justifiable, and their orders valid.

And such is the view which, *in substance*, was taken of the matter by many of our best divines, as the extracts which I shall give presently will show. Others of our divines seem to have relied more upon the *necessity* of the case as a justification, and therefore did in reality quite as much give up the absolute essentiality of episcopal succession to a Church. On whatever grounds, however, they might place it, certain it is that, as a body, they held the orders of the foreign reformed Churches to be valid, as I shall now proceed to show, aye, even in the case of those whom our opponents have, I am sorry to say, according to custom, recklessly set down in their list of witnesses for their doctrine on this point.

Mr. Keble allows that "it is notorious" that Jewel,

Whitgift, Bishop Cooper, and others, to whom the management of the controversy with the Puritans was intrusted during the early part of Elizabeth's reign, did not take the line of argument which he and his party now do. "It is enough," he says, "with them to show that the government by archbishops and bishops is ancient and allowable; *they never venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy sacraments,*" while he allows that "it *must* have occurred to the learned writers above mentioned." And he thus tries to account for the conduct he attributes to them;—"One obvious reason, and probably the chief one, of their silence, was the relation in which they stood to the foreign protestant congregations. The question had been mixed up with considerations of personal friendship." "The leading protestant divines" "had occasionally committed themselves to statements and principles which would greatly stand in their way if ever they found it requisite to assert the claims of Apostolical episcopacy." "Should it be asked how such accomplished divines, as Jewel and others of his class undoubtedly were, could permit themselves, for any present benefit to the Church, so to waver in so capital a point, with the full evidence of antiquity before their eyes, it may be replied, first of all, that in some sort they wanted that full evidence with which later generations have been favoured." "The works of the Fathers had not yet been critically sifted, so that in regard of almost every one of them, men were more or less embarrassed, during the whole of that age, with vague suspicions of interpolation." "Further, it is obvious that those divines in particular who had been instrumental but a little before in the second change of the Liturgy in King Edward's time, must have felt themselves in some measure restrained from pressing with its entire force the ecclesiastical tradition on Church government and orders, inasmuch as in the aforesaid revision they had *given up altogether the same tradition* regarding certain *very material* points in

the celebration, *if not in the doctrine*, of the Holy Eucharist ;” and he thinks “ an indefinite fear of interpolation in the early Liturgies ” may have told in justifying to their minds the omissions in question. But “ it should seem that those who were responsible for those omissions must have felt themselves *precluded ever after from urging the necessity of episcopacy, or of anything else, on the ground of uniform Church tradition.* ” “ To all these causes of hesitation, we must add the direct influence of the court.”¹

Such is the account which Mr. Keble gives of the views and conduct of our Reformers. I leave it with the reader, as it would be equally painful as it is unnecessary to dissect it. The simple question is, Did these learned divines hold the orders of the foreign reformed Churches to be essentially invalid, or did they not? The reader has seen the straits to which our opponents are reduced, to account for their language on the subject; and that the utmost that is pretended respecting them is, that their language is a sort of negative and inconsistent testimony, which prevents their being adducible by either party in this question, for that though they take practically low ground on the subject, they very possibly held theoretically the high ground of the Apostolical succession. It is no doubt an ingenious way of eliminating negative quantities, and getting rid of awkward witnesses. But is it a fair one? However, we shall find afterwards that authors are quoted in the *Catena of witnesses for this doctrine* who have expressly and in terms opposed it, and therefore we need not wonder at the force of prejudice displayed here.

To accumulate extracts from the works of our reformers, to show that they acknowledged the foreign reformed Churches to be true Churches, and their ministers true ministers of Christ, would be, I suppose, a superfluous labour. “ We are very sure,” says Bishop Burnet,

¹ Keble's Pref. to Hooker, pp. lix—lxii.

“that not only those who penned the articles, but the body of this Church, for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches, so constituted, to be true Churches, as to all the essentials of a Church.” (On Art. 23.) And as it respects Jewel, I suspect our opponents will themselves allow that the following passage goes much beyond such an admission. He is a dangerous author for them to meddle with. Let them remember what their advocate, Mr. Froude, has said of his works. “Therefore,” he says, “we neither have bishops without Church, nor Church without bishops. Neither doth the Church of England this day depend of them, whom you often call apostates, *as if our Church were no Church without them. . . . If there were not one, neither of them nor of us, left alive, yet would not, therefore, the whole Church of England flee to Lovaine.* Tertullian saith, ‘And we being laymen, are we not priests? It is written, Christ hath made us both a kingdom and priests unto God his Father. The authority of the Church, and the honour by the Assembly or Council of Order, sanctified of God, hath made a difference between the lay and the clergy. Where, as there is no assembly of ecclesiastical order, the priest being there alone (without the company of other priests) doth both minister the oblation, and also baptize.¹ Yea, and be there but three together, and though they be laymen, yet is there a Church. For every man liveth of his own faith.’ Whosoever is a member of Christ’s body, whosoever is a child of the Church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth his name, is fully invested with this priesthood [i. e. as he explains it in the context, the “*inward* priesthood”], and therefore may justly be called a priest. And wheresoever there be three such together, as Tertullian saith, yea, though they be only

¹ Jewel quotes here from the corrupt reading of the early Romish editions. We have given the true reading of this passage, p. 52 above; which, it will be observed, makes the passage still stronger in favour of the object for which Jewel quoted it.

laymen, yet have they a Church All Christian men are priests, and offer up to God the daily sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of Christ's passion."¹ This passage, I suspect, goes much beyond what we are here contending for.

But passing over those about whose sentiments no impartial persons can entertain a doubt, let us proceed to those who came after them in the Church, who are more particularly claimed by our opponents as witnessing in their favour; and that the names chosen may be free from all objection, we will take some of those that are quoted by our opponents, in their "Catena" on this subject,² as express witnesses in favour of their doctrine.

First, Hooker. The quotation given in the "Catena" is, as is not unusual in these "Catenas," one which is utterly insufficient to show Hooker's opinion on the point in question, one way or the other; and elsewhere he speaks thus, "Now whereashereupon some do infer that no ordination can stand, but only such as is made by bishops which have had their ordination likewise by other bishops before them, till we come to the very Apostles of Christ themselves; in which respect *it was demanded of Beza at Poissie*, 'By what authority he could administer the Holy Sacraments, &c.' [the reader will observe *the instance cited*] . . . to this we answer, that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop. The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain; howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be, in some cases, not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways. Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God himself doth of himself raise up any Another . . . when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which

¹ Déf. of Apol. Pt. 2. c. 5. div. 1. Works, pp. 129, 30.

² See Tract 74.

otherwise we would willingly keep.”¹ And, in a former passage of the same book, he distinctly admits the power of the Church at large to take away the episcopal form of government from the Church, and says, “*Let them [i. e. bishops] continually bear in mind, that it is rather the force of custom, whereby the Church, having so long found it good to continue under the regiment of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honour them in that respect, than that any such true and heavenly law can be showed by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters for ever to be under the regiment of bishops,*” adding that “*their authority*” is “*a sword which the Church hath power to take from them.*”² And therefore, though he admits the office and superiority of bishops to be of Apostolical institution, yet all that he undertakes to prove on the subject is, that such superiority is “*a thing allowable, lawful, and good.*”³

This, I confess, appears to me rather low ground to take; but certainly it shows the complete contrariety of Hooker’s views to those of our opponents. What is Mr. Keble’s explanation in his preface to Hooker? That Hooker “*shrunk from the legitimate result of HIS OWN PREMISES;*” “*he did not feel at liberty to press unreservedly, and develope, in all its consequences, that part of the argument which they [i. e. Laud and others] regarded as the most vital and decisive: THE NECESSITY, namely, of the Apostolical commission to the derivation of sacramental grace, and to our mystical communion with Christ.*”⁴ Such is the treatment awarded to one of our most learned and judicious divines. To offer any defence of Hooker against such charges, would be a waste of words indeed. *But there is one question which I would seriously ask of the author of the Catena, namely, how he can reconcile it with fair dealing, when it is notorious, and*

¹ Eccl. Pol. vii. 14. See also iii. 11.

² Eccl. Pol. vi. 8. See also i. 14, and iii. 10.

³ Eccl. Pol. vii. 3.

⁴ Pref. to Hooker, p. lxxvii.

confessed by his own party, that Hooker did not follow out "his own premises" (to use their phrase) so as to maintain their doctrine, but expressly repudiates it, to select a passage so worded as to lead a cursory reader to think that Hooker held it, and put it as a proof of Hooker's advocacy of their doctrine in the "Catena" of witnesses for it. In what position does such a fact leave their boasted "Catenas?" This is one of the most painful parts of the whole subject, and one on which it is impossible not to feel strongly; because the cause that, beyond all others, has tended to produce the partial and temporary success our opponents have gained, is the supposition derived from their "Catenas," that they are only enforcing the doctrines which almost all our great divines have held before them.

Another divine quoted in the "Catena," is Archbishop Bancroft, and on the same ground I suppose as Hooker, namely, that he held the episcopate to be an Apostolical institution. But they will find equally as in the last case, that neither did Archbishop Bancroft follow out "his own premises." For the Archbishop of St. Andrews, in his History of Scotland, tells us, "that when the Scots bishops were to be consecrated by the bishops of London, Ely, and Bath, here at London house, anno 1609, a question was moved by Dr. Andrews, bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, must first be ordained presbyters as having received no ordination from a bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained, 'that thereof there was no necessity, seeing *where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful*, otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches.' This applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced."¹ And this testimony is the more remarkable from Dr. Bancroft, as in his famous sermon at Paul's Cross, he was considered to have taken rather high ground as to the claims of episcopacy.

¹ See "The judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh, &c," edited by Dr. Bernard, 1657. 8vo. pp. 135, 6.

Another of our opponents' witnesses in their "Catena" is Archdeacon Francis Mason. An extract is given from his celebrated "Vindiciæ." Now will it be believed that the same author, in an appendix to this very work, expressly defends "*the validity of the ordination of the ministers of the reformed Churches beyond the seas*;"¹ and Dr. Bernard, Archbishop Usher's chaplain, when noticing this work, says, "I have been assured it was not only the judgment of Bishop Overal, but that he had a principal hand in it."² Let me direct their attention to one or two extracts from this *appendix* to the very work from which they themselves quote.

The Bishop "in his consecration," he says, "receiveth a sacred office, an eminency, a jurisdiction, a dignity, a degree of ecclesiastical pre-eminence." "He hath no higher degree in respect of intention or extension of the character; but he hath a higher degree, that is, a more excellent place in respect of authority and jurisdiction in spiritual regiment. *Wherefore, seeing a presbyter is equal to a bishop in the power of order, he hath equally intrinsical power to give orders.*" (pp. 160, 161.) Whereby he means, I conceive, that a presbyter, having received the full sacerdotal character, is *intrinsically* capable of passing that character to others, when an office or jurisdiction is given him by the Church in which such power may regularly and canonically be exercised. The speaker for the Romanists, making the precise objection of our opponents, observes,—"*the pre-eminence of bishops is jure divino.*" To which *Orthodox* answers thus,—"*First, if you mean by jure divino that which is according to the Scripture, then the pre-eminence of bishops is jure divino: for it hath been already proved to be according to the Scripture. Secondly, if by jure divino you mean the ordinance of God, in this sense also it may be said to be jure divino. For it is an ordinance of the Apostles, whereunto they*

¹ It was published under this title, Oxf. 1641. 4to.

² See his "Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh, &c." 1657. p. 133.

were directed by God's Spirit, even by the spirit of prophecy, and consequently the ordinance of God. But if by *jure divino* you understand a law and commandment of God, binding all Christian Churches, universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted; in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it, to be *jure divino*." "The Apostles in their lifetime ordained many bishops, and left a fair pattern to posterity. The Church, following the commodiousness thereof, imbraced it in all ages through the Christian world." (p. 163.) This passage may, I hope, disabuse the minds of our opponents of the notion that every body that held the pre-eminence of bishops to be *jure divino*, or by Apostolical institution, is not to be immediately put down as a supporter of their doctrine, nor to be charged with forsaking the legitimate consequences of "his own premises" if he does not hold it, and may teach them to be a little more circumspect, and I may add, *fair*, in the getting up of their "Catenas."

The Archdeacon then proceeds to defend the validity of the ordinations in the foreign reformed Churches, first on the ground of *necessity*; to which the defender of the Church of Rome, after some discussion, ultimately replies,—“Suppose that ordination might be devolved to Presbyters in case of necessity, yet the necessity ceasing, such extraordinary courses should likewise cease. Why, then, do they continue their former practice? Why do they not now seek to receive their orders from Protestant bishops?” To which *Orthodox* replies thus:—“*The Churches of Germany need not to seek to foreign bishops, because they have superintendents or bishops among themselves. And as for other places which embrace the discipline of Geneva, they also have bishops in effect, for two things of all other are most proper to bishops; (1) singularity in succeeding, because, though there be many presbyters in a Church, yet, above the rest, there is one star, one angel, of whose unity depends the unity of the Church;*

and therefore, when he dieth, another must succeed in the like singularity. (2) Superiority in ordaining, because ever since the Apostles' times, these *stars* and *angels* have been invested with the power of ordination, which they might perform without presbyters, but presbyters might not regularly perform without them. Now, in these reformed Churches, the president of each Presbytery is their *star* or *angel*, indued with both properties. Concerning the first, Beza saith, 'Essentiale fuit, &c.' 'This was essential in the matter we have in hand, that by God's perpetual ordinance it hath been, is, and shall be, needful that some one in the presbytery, which is first both in place and dignity, should have the pre-eminence in ruling of every action with that right which is given him from God.' (Beza de div. gradib. minist. contr. Sarav. c. 23. § 25.) Therefore, concerning the second, whereas the presbytery consisteth partly of ministers, partly of laymen, their lay-presbyters are wholly excluded from ordination. For Calvin (in 2 Tim. i. 6, and Instit. lib. 4. c. 3. § 16,) teacheth, that in the Apostolic times, only pastors imposed hands, neither is it lawful for every pastor in the presbytery to execute this office; but it is reserved to him who is first both in place and dignity, having pre-eminence in every action, and consequently in ordination. Wherefore, though that he do it not by his sole authority, but with common consent, neither hath the name of a bishop or such ample titles annexed as godly princes have thought fit for the honor of the place, (because these things are not suitable with popular estates delighting in equality) yet he hath *the substance of the office itself*; which he exerciseth not in one only particular parish, but in the city, suburbs, and the territories thereof, containing sundry parishes, as for example, at Geneva, xxiv or thereabout. Wherefore, seeing a bishop and a presbyter do not differ in order, but only in pre-eminence and jurisdiction, as yourselves acknowledge, and seeing Calvin and Beza had the order of priesthood, which is the highest order in the Church of God, and were *lawfully chosen*, the

one after the other, to a place of eminency, and indued with jurisdiction *derived unto them from the whole Church wherein they lived*—you cannot with reason deny them *the substance of the episcopal office*. And whereinsoever their discipline is defective we wish them, even in the bowels of Christ Jesus, by all possible means, to redress and reform it, and to conform themselves to the antient custom of the Church of Christ, which hath continued from the Apostles' time, that so they may remove all opinion of singularity, and stop the mouth of malice itself. Thus much concerning the ministers of other reformed Churches, wherein, if you will not believe us disputing for *the lawfulness of their calling*, yet you must give us leave to believe God himself from heaven approving their ministry by pouring down a blessing upon their labours. Bless them still, O Lord, and bless us, and make all our ministry faithful, fruitful, and effectual, to the comfort of our own consciences, the advancing of thy kingdom, the joy of thy little flock, and to the recalling of those lost sheep which as yet wander in the wilderness of the Church of Rome, or elsewhere, that so it may be powerful by thy Spirit to the salvation of many thousand souls." (pp. 173—6.) To which prayer I most heartily respond, amen, and humbly pray that it may please God to impart more of the spirit breathed in these lines to his whole Church.

To go through our opponents' whole Catena is, of course, impossible in this place, but I will venture to affirm that it would be easy to show, as to three-fourths at least of the authors there cited, that they are equally opposed to our opponents' views as the three we have just noticed. And indeed, if the reader will take the trouble of investigating the extracts they themselves have given, he will find very few that at all bear upon the disputed points. I am sorry to say, however, that this seems to be the plan commonly adopted by the Tractators. *Under a phrase which may be interpreted in various ways, they lay down a certain doctrine, and then quote as sup-*

porters of their views, all those who have defended any doctrine that has borne the same name.

To the divines already mentioned as opposing the views of the Tractators, we may add, as ranking among the most learned and unexceptionable witnesses for the doctrine of our Church, the names of Archbishop Usher, Bishop Davenant, Dean Field, and Bishop Cosin, whom I mention, not because they were at all remarkable for their sentiments in the matter, but because their testimonies happen to be at hand with me to refer to.¹

“I have ever declared my opinion to be,” says Archbishop Usher at the close of his life, “that *episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt non ordine*, and consequently that in places where bishops cannot be had the ordination by presbyters standeth valid, yet on the other side, holding as I do that a bishop hath superiority in degree above a presbyter, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such presbyters as have severed themselves from those bishops unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical. And howsoever I must needs think that the Churches which have no bishops are thereby become very much defective in their government, and that the Churches in France who living under a Popish power cannot do what they would, are more excusable in this defect than the Low Countries that live under a free State, yet for the testifying *my communion with those Churches, which I do love and honour as true members of the Church Universal, I do profess that with like affection I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers if I were in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers if I were in Charentone.*”² And who, I ask, of all our divines is more worthy to be listened to on such a point than Archbishop Usher?

¹ It would be easy to add similar statements from the writings of Laud, Bramhall, Andrews, and many others.

² Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh, &c. ed. by Dr. Bernard. 1657. pp. 125—7.

To the same effect speaks Bishop Davenant.¹

For the sentiments of Bishop Cosin respecting the foreign reformed Churches I refer to the following passages. In a work entitled "Dr. Cosin's opinion when Dean of Peterborough and in exile *for communicating rather with Geneva than Rome*,"² we have a letter written to a friend here during his exile, in which he says, "It is far less safe to join with these men that alter the *credenda*, the vitals of religion [alluding to the Romanists], than with those that meddle only with the *agenda* and *rules* of religion, if they meddle no further. . . . They of Geneva are to blame in many things and defective in some; they shall never have my approbation of their doings, nor let them have yours, yet I do not see that they have set up any new articles of faith under pain of damnation to all the world that will not receive them for such articles, and you know whose case that is." (pp. 3, 4.) And in his last Will he says,—“Wherever in the whole world Churches reckoned as Christian Churches profess the true, antient, and catholic religion and faith, and with one mouth and mind adore and worship God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, with such, though distance, or the disagreements of mankind, or any other obstacle, may ever prevent my actually holding communion (*jungi*) with them, in heart, mind, and affection, I shall always be united and form one (*conjungor ac coalesco*); which I wish especially to be understood of the Protestant and well-reformed Churches.”³

Still more clearly and fully speaks the learned Dean Field, in his celebrated Work "Of the Church." "The next thing to be examined," he says, "is, whether the power of ordination be so essentially annexed to the order of bishops, that none but bishops may in any case ordain. For the clearing whereof we must observe, that the whole ecclesiastical power is aptly divided into the power of

¹ Determ. 42. p. 191.

² Published by Dr. R. Watson. Lond. 1684. 8vo.

³ I quote from the Preface to his "Regni Angliæ Religio et Gubern. Eccles." Lond. 1729. 4to. p. ii.

order and *jurisdiction* The power of holy or ecclesiastical *order* is nothing else but that power which is specially given to men sanctified and set apart from others to perform certain sacred supernatural and eminent actions, which others of another rank may not at all or not ordinarily meddle with : as to preach the word, administer the sacraments, and the like. The next kind of ecclesiastical power is that of *jurisdiction*. For the more distinct and full understanding whereof, we must note that three things are implied in the calling of ecclesiastical ministers. First, an election, choice or designment of persons fit for so high and excellent employment. Secondly, the consecrating of them and giving them power and authority to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God. . . . Thirdly, the assigning and dividing out to each man thus sanctified to so excellent a work, that portion of God's people which he is to take care of, who must be directed by him in things that pertain to the hope of eternal salvation. This particular assignation giveth to them that had only the power of order before the power of jurisdiction also over the persons of men. Thus, then, it is necessary that the people of God be sorted into several portions, and the sheep of Christ divided into several flocks, for the more orderly guiding of them. . . . The Apostles of Christ and their successors, when they planted the Churches, so divided the people of God converted by their ministry into particular Churches, that each city and the places near adjoining did make but one Church. Now, because the unity and peace of each particular Church of God, and flock of his sheep, dependeth on the unity of the pastor, and yet the necessities of the many duties that are to be performed in Churches of so large extent require more ecclesiastical ministers than one, therefore, though there be many presbyters, that is, many fatherly guides of one Church, yet there is one amongst the rest that is specially pastor of the place, who for distinction sake is named a bishop; to whom an eminent and peerless power is given for the avoiding of

schisms and factions; and the rest are but his assistants and coadjutors, and named by the general name of presbyters. So that, in the performance of the acts of ecclesiastical ministry, when he is present and will do them himself, they must give place, and in his absence, or when being present he needeth assistance, they may do nothing without his consent and liking. Yea, so far, for order's sake, is he preferred before the rest, that some things are specially reserved to him only, as the ordaining of such as should assist him in the work of his ministry, the reconciling of penitents, confirmation of such as were baptized by imposition of hands, dedication of Churches, and such like. These being the divers sorts and kinds of ecclesiastical power, it will easily appear to all them that enter into the due consideration thereof, that the power of ecclesiastical or sacred order, that is, the power and authority to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God, and to perform eminent acts of gracious efficacy, tending to the procuring of the eternal good of the sons of men, is equal and the same in all those whom we call presbyters, that is, fatherly guides of God's Church and people; and that only for order's sake, and the preservation of peace, there is a limitation of the use and exercise of the same. Hereunto agree all the best learned amongst the Romanists themselves, freely confessing that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct and higher order or power of order, but a kind of dignity and office or imployment only. Which they prove because a presbyter ordained *per saltum*, that never was consecrated or ordained deacon, may notwithstanding do all those acts that pertain to the deacon's order, because the higher order doth always imply in it the lower and inferior in an eminent and excellent sort. But a bishop ordained *per saltum*, that never had the ordination of a presbyter, can neither consecrate and administer the sacrament of the Lord's body, nor ordain a presbyter, himself being none, nor do any act peculiarly pertaining to presbyters. Whereby it is most evident, that that

wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct power of order, but an eminency and dignity only, specially yielded to one above all the rest of the same rank for order sake, and to preserve the unity and peace of the Church. Hence it followeth, that many things, which in some cases presbyters may lawfully do, are peculiarly reserved unto bishops, as Hierome noteth, *rather for the honour of their ministry than the necessity of any law*. And therefore we read, that presbyters in some places, and at some times, did impose hands and confirm such as were baptized, which when Gregory Bishop of Rome would wholly have forbidden, there was so great exception taken to him for it, that he left it free again. And who knoweth not that all presbyters, in cases of necessity, may absolve and reconcile penitents, a thing in ordinary course appropriated unto bishops? And why not by the same reason ordain presbyters and deacons in cases of like necessity? For seeing the cause why they are forbidden to do these acts, is, because to bishops ordinarily the care of all Churches is committed, and to them in all reason the ordination of such as must serve in the Church pertaineth that have the chief care of the Church, and have Churches wherein to employ them; which only bishops have as long as they retain their standing, and not presbyters, being but assistants to bishops in their Churches; if they become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholic and being of a better spirit, so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the work of the ministry pertains to them likewise. For if the power of order and authority to intermeddle in things pertaining to God's service be the same in all presbyters, and that they be limited in the execution of it only for order sake, so that in case of necessity every of them may baptize and confirm them whom they have baptized, absolve and reconcile penitents, and do all those other acts which regularly are appropriated unto the bishop alone, there is no reason to be given but that in

case of necessity, wherein all bishops were extinguished by death, or being fallen into heresy should refuse to ordain any to serve God in his true worship, but that presbyters, as they may do all other acts, whatsoever special challenge bishops in ordinary course make unto them, might do this also. Who, then, dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by presbyters in sundry Churches of the world, at such times as bishops in those parts where they lived opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it? Surely the best learned in the Church of Rome in former times durst not pronounce all ordinations of this nature to be void. For not only Armachanus, a very learned and worthy bishop, but, as it appeareth by Alexander of Hales, many learned men in his time and before were of opinion that in some cases and at some times presbyters may give orders, and that their ordinations are of force, though to do so, not being urged by extreme necessity, cannot be excused from over great boldness and presumption . . . All that may be alleged out of the Fathers for proof of the contrary may be reduced to two heads. For, first, whereas they make all such ordinations void as are made by presbyters, it is to be understood according to the strictness of the canons in use in their time, and not absolutely in the nature of the thing, which appears in that they likewise make all ordinations *sine titulo* to be void; all ordinations of bishops ordained by fewer than three bishops with the metropolitan; all ordinations of presbyters by bishops out of their own Churches without special leave; whereas I am well assured the Romanists will not pronounce any of these to be void, though the parties so doing are not excusable from all fault. Secondly, their sayings are to be understood regularly not without exception of some special cases that may fall out.”¹ And further on in the same work he quotes with approbation the following remarks of Durandus (in 4 Sent. Dist. 24, q. 5,) “Touching the

¹ FIELD, *Of the Church*, bk. iii. c. 39. pp. 155—8.

power of consecration or order," saith Durandus, "it is much doubted of among divines whether any be greater therein than an ordinary presbyter; for Hierome seemeth to have been of opinion that the highest power of consecration or order is the power of a priest or elder, so that every priest in respect of his priestly power may minister all sacraments, confirm the baptized, give all orders, all blessings and consecrations; but that for the avoiding of the peril of schism it was ordained that one should be chosen who should be named a bishop, to whom the rest should obey, and to whom it was reserved to give orders, and to do some such other things as none but bishops do. And afterwards he saith that Hierome is clearly of this opinion; not making the distinction of bishops from presbyters a mere human invention or a thing not necessary, as Aerius did, but thinking that amongst them who are equal in the power of order, and equally enabled to do any sacred act, the Apostles, for the avoiding of schism and confusion, and the preservation of unity, peace, and order, ordained that in each Church one should be before and above the rest, without whom the rest should do nothing, and to whom some things should be peculiarly reserved, as the dedicating of churches, reconciling of penitents, confirming of the baptized, and the ordination of such as are to serve in the work of the ministry; of which the three former were reserved to the bishop alone, *potius ad honorem sacerdotii quam ad legis necessitatem*, that is rather to honour his priestly and bishoply place than for that these things at all may not be done by any other."¹

The reader will observe, then, that the ground here taken by Dean Field is, that a presbyter at his ordination receives full power to perform all the functions of the divine ministry and service, all sacred acts of whatever kind, the exercise of which power however is to be regulated by the situation in which he may be placed in the Church. Hence it is said that a presbyter and a bishop

¹ Ib. bk. v. c. 27, p. 500.

do not differ in order but only in office, which, notwithstanding it has been cavilled at as an unmeaning and nugatory distinction, appears to me a very intelligible and useful one.

By the consideration of these authorities, then, and especially from their own admissions as to our early reformers, I hope that our opponents will be more ready to draw a distinction between a rule being laid down by our Church in this matter, as most agreeable to ecclesiastical order, to serve for the guidance of her own members, and a solemn determination by her that all who differ from that standard are without any lawful ministry. "The 23d Article," says Mr. Keble, "affirms the principle of the succession." "The Article virtually enforces succession as the test of a *lawful ministry*." (pp. 97, 8.) True, as it respects *our own Church*, but not as it respects "*a lawful ministry*" in the abstract. Mr. Keble has himself admitted that our early reformers shrunk from any such avowal. Nay, Hooker's instance of valid unepiscopal orders is that of Beza, precisely the sort of case Mr. Keble has supposed (p. 98) and pronounced against. Now all Mr. Keble's argumentation refers only to the abstract case, for no one disputes what sort of ordination is alone admitted in the Church of England as a qualification for her own ministers, and therefore his application of the Article falls to the ground, and is clearly an oversight, for it was drawn up by those whom he blames for never having avowed such doctrine.

"I do allow episcopacy," says Dean Sherlock, "to be an Apostolical institution, and the truly antient and catholic government of the Church, of which more hereafter; but yet in this very book I prove industriously and at large, that in case of necessity, when bishops cannot be had, a Church may be a *truly Catholic Church*, and such as we may and ought to communicate with, *without bishops*, in vindication of some foreign reformed Churches who have none, and therefore I do not make episcopacy so ab-

solutely necessary to catholic communion as to unchurch all Churches which have it not.”¹ “The Church of England does not deny but that in case of necessity the ordination of presbyters may be valid.”²

And surely the practice of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for many years in their employment of missionaries who had received only Lutheran orders, shows what the general feeling among the prelates of our Church in later times has been as to the validity of such orders.³

And as it respects that which is *essential* to the *being* of a Church, the excellent Dr. Claget (so highly commended by Archbishop Sharp⁴), in his examination of Bellarmine’s seventh note of the Church, viz. “the union of the members among themselves, and with the Head,” having pointed out seven “grounds and notions of Church-unity,” which “ought” all to be in the Church, adds, “But some of them are necessary to the being of the Church; and they are, the acknowledgment of the *one Lord*, the profession of the *one faith*, and admission into the state of Christian duties and privileges by *one baptism*. *And this is all that I can find absolutely necessary to the being of a Church; inasmuch as the Apostle says, ‘That we are all baptized into one body.’* And therefore, so far as unity in these things is spread and obtains in the world, so far and no farther is the body of the Church propagated, because it is one by this unity The Church of England . . doth not unchurch those parts of Christendom that hold the unity of the faith. From hence, also, the folly of that conceit may be easily discerned that, in this divided state of Christendom, there must be one Church,

¹ Vindication of some Protestant principles of Church unity and catholic communion in Bishop Gibson’s *Preservative*, vol. iii. p. 410.

² *Ib.* p. 432.

³ See the Reports of the Society and Dean Pearson’s *Life of Schwartz*.

⁴ See *Life of Archbishop Sharp*.

which is the only Church of Christ, exclusively to all the rest that are not in communion with her; which is as much as to say, That because there is not that unity amongst Christians which there ought to be, therefore there is none at all; and because they are not united in one communion, therefore they are not united in one Lord, one faith, one baptism.”¹

There is a great difference between a body of men wanting some of those things that are requisite to the perfection of a Church, and not being a Church at all.

These remarks of Dr. Claget naturally lead me to notice a case which our preceding observations have not touched.

What we have hitherto said refers only to such cases as those of the foreign reformed Churches, and the Church of Scotland; not to the schismatical ordinations performed by presbyters or others in an episcopal Church professing the orthodox faith; and if our observations may be considered as showing that the orders of those Churches, though somewhat irregular, are not essentially invalid, then it will, of course, be granted by *all*, that the sacraments are valid as administered by them. The doctrine of “episcopal grace” we shall consider presently.

But there is also another class of ecclesiastical communities, whose case certainly differs from that of those we have just been considering, namely, the Protestant Dissenters. With respect to these, the language of our opponents is, of course, still more severe (as, doubtless, they have laid themselves far more open to censure) than concerning the former. The Dissenters appear to be left without hesitation to the uncovenanted mercies of God, that is, (whatever our opponents may say to the contrary,) to no mercies at all; for, if a body of men living in the

¹ Brief discourse concerning the notes of the Church, pp. 166—9, or Bishop Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. i. Tit. 3. c. 2. pp. 121—3; and see Dean Sherlock's *Vindic. of his Disc. conc. the notes of the Church*.

midst of the Christian Church, and professing to belong to it, have acted so as to put themselves beyond the pale of all God's *covenanted* mercies, it is a mere evasion, for the purpose of avoiding a charge of uncharitableness, to insinuate that they may find mercy in a way that has not been promised. Let those who say this, take heed by what rule they are measuring God's covenant.

This is a painful subject to discuss, nor is it pertinent to our present subject to do more than briefly touch upon it ; but whatever censures may belong to those who cause needless divisions in a Church, whatever punishment we may think it probable that God will inflict upon those among them who are of a really schismatical spirit and temper, and surely such are no trifling sins, I feel bound to protest against the doctrine of our opponents on the subject.

The Tractators seem to argue thus, that because Christ ordained pastors for his Church, therefore the ministry of the word and sacraments is so exclusively in their hands, that if, by any means, they are removed, the people must be altogether without those privileges. But the latter is by no means a consequence of the former. The institution of pastors for the Church, is a wise, and useful, and merciful provision for the wants of the Church. It does not show that no one *can* do what they *may* do. It only provides that there shall always be some in the Church to perform certain offices, and guide the people in spiritual things. True, indeed, it follows from this, that an unnecessary interference with the duties devolving upon them by laymen, is contrary to that good order which ought to reign in the Church. Nor can it be denied that, for individuals to break off communion with pastors so constituted, under whom the providence of God had placed them, and set up pastors for themselves, except on the ground of grievous error, is an act of schism, such as would have met with unqualified condemnation from the Apostles. But it is quite another matter to say that a certain form of Church government and pastoral qualifi-

cation is essentially and *per se* necessary, so as to be a *sine qua non* to union with the Christian Church.

What says Hooker on this point? "Whereupon, because the only object which separateth ours from other religions is Jesus Christ, in whom none but the Church doth believe, and whom none but the Church doth worship, we find that accordingly the Apostles do everywhere distinguish hereby the Church from infidels and from Jews; accounting '*them which call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to be his Church.*' If we go lower we shall but add unto this certain casual and variable accidents, which are not properly of the being; but make only for the *happier and better being* of the Church of God, either in deed, or in men's opinions and conceits. *This is the error of all Popish definitions that hitherto have been brought.* They define not the Church by that which the Church essentially is, but *by that wherein they imagine their own more perfect than the rest are.* Touching parts of eminency and perfection, parts likewise of imperfection and defect, in the Church of God, they are infinite; their degrees and differences no way possible to be drawn unto any certain account. There is not the least contention and variance, but it blemisheth somewhat the unity that ought to be in the Church of Christ, which notwithstanding may have not only without offence or breach of concord her manifold varieties in rites and ceremonies of religion, but also her strifes and contentions many times, and that about matters of no small importance, *yea, her schisms, factions, and such other evils, whereunto the body of the Church is subject, sound and sick remaining both of the same body, as long as both parts retain, by outward profession, that vital substance of truth, which maketh Christian religion to differ from theirs, which acknowledge not our Lord Jesus Christ, the blessed Saviour of mankind; give no credit to his glorious Gospel, and have his Sacraments, the seals of eternal life, in derision.*"¹ And elsewhere, speaking more fully on this subject, he says,—

¹ Bk. V. c. 68.

“ *The unity of which visible body and Church of Christ consisteth in that uniformity, which all several persons thereunto belonging have, by reason of that one Lord whose servants they all profess themselves, that one faith which they all acknowledge, that one baptism wherewith they are all initiated.*” “ We speak now of the visible Church, whose children are signed with this mark, ‘one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’” “ All men are, of necessity, either Christians, or not Christians. If by external profession they be Christians, then are they of the visible Church of Christ; and Christians by external profession they are all, whose mark of recognizance hath in it those things which we have mentioned.”¹

With regard to their orders, I freely admit that I know not how, as it respects (to say the least) *most* of them, they can pretend to have any regularly-ordained clergy among them. If we find that in Apostolic times the duties of the ministry were, under ordinary circumstances, and in a regularly-formed Church, only discharged by those who had received a commission deriving its authority originally from Christ, through the Apostles, (and the very fact of such a ministry being formed, shows that such was the case,) then I know not how we can consider any as *regularly* commissioned to perform the duties of the ministerial office, but those who are similarly ordained to it.

But that this *necessarily* and *essentially* vitiates and renders invalid the administration of the sacraments, and all the ministerial acts performed by their pastors, our opponents can never prove. I have already shown² that the testimony of antiquity is opposed to such a notion. Nor does this concession at all tend to nullify the use and importance of the sacred ministry, nor to interfere with the preservation, under all ordinary circumstances, of ecclesiastical order. The same author, Tertullian, who permits the layman, in the absence of the ordained minister, both to baptize and administer the Eucharist, says else-

¹ Bk. iii. c. 1. See the whole context.

² See pp. 51—55 and pp. 58, 59 above.

where, that even the presbyter must not baptize without the leave of the bishop. And the passage is so appropriate in this place, that I will give the reader an extract from it. "The right of giving baptism is possessed by the chief priest, who is the bishop; then by the presbyters and deacons, but not without the authority of the bishop for the sake of the honour [? order] of the Church, which being preserved, peace is preserved. Otherwise laymen have the right; for that which is equally received, may equally be given . . . but how much more is the discipline of modesty and orderly behaviour the duty of laymen, since these things belong to those above them, that they should not assume to themselves the office of episcopacy assigned to bishops. Emulation is the mother of schisms. All things are lawful to me, said the most holy Apostle, but all things are not expedient. Let it suffice that you may use the liberty in cases of necessity, as where the circumstances of the place, time, or person require it. For then the boldness of the helper is allowed, when the circumstances of a person in danger force it. Since a man will be guilty of the destruction of another, if he shall have neglected to give what he might *freely have given*."¹

Ministration in sacred things is confined to the clergy for the sake of ecclesiastical order; which order as it was ordained by God, so a needless infraction of it will doubtless be visited, more or less, according to circumstances, with the marks of his displeasure; and the clergy are set

¹ Dandi [i. e. baptismum] habet jus summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate propter Ecclesiæ honorem [? ordinem], quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est, quod enim ex æquo accipitur ex æquo dari potest . . . sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ incumbit, cum ea majoribus competant, ne sibi adsumant dicatum Episcopis officium Episcopatus. Æmulatio schismatum mater est. Omnia licere, dixit sanctissimus Apostolus, sed non omnia expedire. Sufficiat scilicet in necessitatibus utaris, sicubi aut loci aut temporis aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur cum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditæ hominis si supersederit præstare quod libere potuit. Tertull. De bapt. c. 17. pp. 230, 231.

apart for that ministry, somewhat as the tribe of Levi was set apart for the service of the Temple, under the Old Testament. But that there is *the same distinction* between the clergy and the laity, as there was between the priests and the laity under the Old Testament, is contradicted both by Scripture and antiquity.

If there is a sufficient reason to justify the people in breaking that prescribed ecclesiastical order, and separating themselves from their clergy, there is no essential impediment, where the necessity of the case requires it, to their appointing some from among themselves to fulfil the ministerial function. And a sufficient reason there is, if the faith has been corrupted, and the terms of communion rendered sinful; and hence, we doubt not, a secession from the Church of Rome, had it been made by laymen only, would have been justifiable; and the seceders fully authorized to appoint a ministry from among themselves, (if they could obtain none Apostolically commissioned to join with them in their secession,) and expect the Divine blessing upon their ministrations. Such a secession would certainly have met with the approbation of Cyprian;¹ for although in the case mentioned in the Epistle I have referred to below, nothing perhaps took place that was uncanonical, because there were bishops at hand to countenance what was done; yet the statements and arguments of Cyprian are *general*, and would certainly not have had less force, if all the neighbouring bishops had been involved in the same errors as the bishops there inculpated.

Hence the culpability of such separations depends entirely upon the circumstances under which they are made; and such bodies, though having none among them Apostolically commissioned, *may* yet be sound parts of the Church of Christ, and much more parts of that Church partially only defective.

The consequence is, that the question of union or separation is a case of conscience, in which each man must

¹ Cypr. Ep. ad cler. et pleb. in Hisp. Ep. 68. Pamel. and Fell.

act according to the light which he possesses. And though a man may err in his decision, and thereby even disturb the peace of the Church, and bring much evil upon himself and others, and perhaps expose himself to punishment, I should be loath to maintain that if he has acted with sincerity, and holds the fundamentals of the faith, and regulates his life correspondently, he is not a member of Christ's visible Church; and one, moreover, who is upon the whole in a state of salvation.

"The true notion of a Church," says Dean Sherlock, "is the *cætus fidelium*, or the company of the faithful, of those who profess the true faith of Christ, and are united to him by baptism."—"No Christian can separate from the Catholic Church (in this sense of it, as it signifies the whole company and family of Christians, which is the true notion of the Catholic Church), while he continues a Christian; for that is a contradiction, to be a Christian and not to belong to the whole number of Christians; that is, to be a Christian, and to be no Christian: for if he be a Christian, he belongs to the number of Christians, and then he is a member of the Catholic Church, and consequently not a separatist from it. *Nothing can separate us from the Catholic Church, but what forfeits our Christianity, either a final apostasy or such heresies as are equivalent to apostasy* Schism and separation is a breach of the external and visible communion of the Church, not of the essential unity of it; the Church is one Church still, whatever breaches and schisms there are in its external communion; for the unity of the Catholic Church consists in the union of the whole to Christ, which makes them one body in him; not in the external communion of the several parts of it to each other. And therefore it is not a separation from one another, but only a separation from Christ, which is a separation from the Catholic Church."¹ There may be one Lord, one faith, one baptism, to those who are not in external communion

¹ Disc. conc. the nature, unity, and comm. of the Catholic Church, pp. 32, 52, 53.

with one another. There may be, therefore, a spiritual relationship where, through the infirmity of the flesh, that relationship is not recognized, and does not issue in communion; just as men may be members of one family, who do not live together in friendly communion as of one family.

The doctrine of our Church, therefore, on the subject of Church government, may, I hope, be fully maintained, where it is not considered to involve any such anathemas as our opponents launch against those who have separated from her communion, or to consign any to God's "uncovenanted mercies" who are sound in the fundamentals of the faith, and of a life correspondent to their professed faith, however erroneous may be their notions of ecclesiastical polity.

There is a great difference between a Church laying down necessary articles of communion for her own members, which may be required for the preservation of what she considers to be important in doctrine and polity in her own communion, and her making the maintenance of those articles necessary to every Christian community as a *sine qua non* to their being recognized as part of the orthodox Church of Christ. For the latter, I conceive, such only should be laid down as may be considered to be points simply and absolutely fundamental and necessary to salvation. For otherwise we unchurch those whom we dare not deny that Christ may own as his followers; which seems to me worse than absurd.

Here, then, I leave the case which we are now considering, as I have no inclination to find apologies for those needless schisms and divisions by which our Church has been rent in pieces, and the cause of Christ both here, and if here, throughout the world, seriously injured. Let it not be supposed that in the remarks we have just offered there was any wish to throw a shield over such irregularities, or to make light of unnecessary divisions in the Church. Far from it. We believe them to be sinful. Nay more; the evils inherent in schism and forms of Church government devised by the fancy of man are such as generally bring their own punishment

with them in this world. There is not the same stability in such communions. They are the rendezvous for men of unquiet and turbulent spirits, whose influence upon their respective communities is anything but favourable to genuine piety, and even the peace of society. They are, many of them, for the sake, as it is admitted, of non-essentials, placing impediments to the progress of that cause which they profess to have most at heart. Nay, from an avowed feeling of jealousy, we have seen many of them in the last few years, with a spirit of uncompromising hostility, waging war against the privileges of our Apostolical National Church, from which they have separated, and banding together with Romanists, heretics, and infidels, for the purpose of overthrowing her influence, robbing her of what the piety of preceding generations has placed in her hands to enable her to pursue the objects of her high calling, and, in a word, razing her to the ground.

Surely of such we must say, in the words of Irenæus, "God will judge those who produce schisms, who are destitute of the love of God, contemplating their own profit, and not the unity of the Church, and for the sake of small and trifling causes, dividing and splitting into parts the great and glorious body of Christ, and, as far as in them lies, slaying it; who have *peace in their mouth and war in their acts*, who in very deed *strain at a gnat and swallow a camel*."²

We neither agree, therefore, with those who leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of God, nor with those who are countenancing them in their mistaken course. And it is a matter for the serious consideration of all those members of our Church who believe that God is a God of peace and order, and that unnecessary schisms

² Ανακρινει δε τους τα σχισματα εργαζομενους, κερους οντας της του Θεου αγαπης, και το ιδιον λυσιτελες σκοπουντας, αλλα μη την ενωσιν της εκκλησιας και δια μικρας και τας υψους [τυχουσας] αιτίας το μεγα και ενδοξον σωμα του Χριστου τεμνοντας και διαιρουντας, και οσον το επ' αυτοις αναιρουντας τους ειρηνην λαλουντας, και πολεμον εργαζομενους, αληθως διυλιζοντας τον κωνωπα τον δε καμηλον καταπινοντας. IREN. adv. hæc. lib. iv. c. 62. pp. 359, 60, ed. Grab.

and divisions in his Church are displeasing to him, how far they would be acting agreeably to his will in making light of such divisions, and fraternizing with those who are unnecessarily quarrelling with the constituted order of things in the Church in which God had placed them, and are even seeking to deprive it of all the external privileges with which, in the providence of God, the piety of former ages has endowed it.

I proceed to notice the remaining portion of our opponents' doctrine on this subject.

Whether the grace of the sacraments ordinarily comes only through the sacraments, is a question which, however important in itself, is but indirectly connected with the point now under discussion, and therefore in this place I must pass it over.

But there remains for consideration one more point in the doctrine of our opponents on this subject, namely, their notion of "episcopal grace;" which is, as we have already stated,¹ that by episcopal ordination (such, that is, as they maintain to be the only valid kind) there is conferred in all cases the gift of the Holy Spirit to abide in the person ordained, "as for all other parts of his office, so *for the custody of the good deposit, the fundamentals of doctrine and practice,*" which is called, "the doctrine of ministerial grace derived by succession from the Apostles," or the doctrine of "episcopal grace;" though of course it is admitted that a person may receive this grace in vain, and after receiving it, be "liable to error, and heresy, and apostasy." (p. 105.) And Mr. Keble elsewhere states, that "the obvious meaning of 2 Tim. i. 14, is, that the treasure of sound doctrine was to be guarded by the grace of the Apostolical succession." "Apostolical or episcopal grace is, by God's ordinance, the guardian of sound doctrine; the Spirit abiding in Timothy is to watch incessantly the deposit or trust of divine truth left in his charge; and where the one, the succession, fails, there, as this verse would lead us to expect, and as all Church-

¹ See p. 73 above.

history proves, the other, the truth of doctrine, is immediately in imminent jeopardy.”¹

Now thus much we readily grant, that the ministry being of God’s own appointment, and intended for continuance to the end of time, for the edification of his Church, (Eph. iv. 11—13,) we may humbly hope that God’s blessing will more or less rest upon it, and his Spirit be vouchsafed, to enable those who are called to that work to fulfil it so as to accomplish his purposes. And in each portion of the Church such an expectation might reasonably be entertained from the first on behalf of its pastors, until facts should seem to show that such blessing was withdrawn.

But that He has tied his gifts to the acts and appointments of man, so that they are only bestowed in one precise channel, we have no ground for affirming. And hence Bishop Jewell rebukes Harding for supposing that “unto such succession God hath bound the Holy Ghost,” when “by succession, Christ saith, Desolation shall sit in the Holy Place, and Antichrist shall press into the room of Christ;” and to the remark, that “succession is the chief way for any Christian man to avoid Antichrist,” (which seems to be precisely Mr. Keble’s view,) he replies, “I grant you, *if you mean the succession of DOCTRINE.*”² Supposing that our opponents’ whole scheme was precisely laid down by our Lord himself, it follows not that there may not be a general corruption of doctrine among the pastors so appointed, and that others not so appointed may minister in sacred things acceptably in their place in consequence of their defection; and by their *doctrine* (as I shall show presently) the Fathers held that they were to be tried whether they were truly successors of the Apostles.

But these words of Mr. Keble clearly *imply*, that wherever the Apostolical succession is preserved, there, in every ordination, the Holy Spirit is given, to abide in

¹ Serm. pp. 42, 44; and see p. 51.

² Def. of Apol. Pt. ii. ch. 5. div. 1. Works, p. 139.

the ordained for the preservation of the *fundamentals* of the faith; and that where the Apostolical succession has failed, there (though they may by possibility be preserved for a time) we cannot, to say the least, expect to find them, and they are left as it were to accident, persons in such a situation not being recognized as any part of the Church.

Now this goes beyond what some even of the most strenuous Romish advocates for the Apostolical succession contend for; for Bellarmine himself, though he makes such succession a necessary note of the Church, does not make it a sure and infallible note, as this would do. But it is neither one nor the other, for it will not, I suppose, be denied, that there may be soundness in the fundamentals of the faith where that succession is not to be found, and therefore it is no distinctive note of the Church. What says even Archbishop Laud? "For succession in the general I shall say this. It is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued; and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the antient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession a necessary sign or mark of the true Church in any one place." And he adds, that Stapleton, in saying that "sound doctrine is indivisible from true and lawful succession," had "forsaken truth."¹

Nay, does not the history of the Church present us with instances where the fundamentals of the faith have not been preserved, and yet the outward succession has remained unimpaired, as in the case of the Arians?

Will it be said, then, that in such a case the Holy Spirit is still given to abide in a man for the preservation of the fundamentals of the faith, when both the ordained and the ordainer are in error in the fundamentals? For instance, when Arians ordained Arians, was the Holy Spirit necessarily given by that ordination to abide in the person ordained, for the preservation of the fundamentals of the faith, because the person ordaining had the true

¹ Answer to Fisher, § 39. n. 7, 8. pp. 249, 250. ed. 1686.

Apostolical succession, and pronounced the words, Receive the Holy Ghost? Such a proposition is surely too monstrous to be entertained for a moment. It follows, then, that the Holy Spirit is not always thus given through ordinations performed strictly according to the Apostolical succession. And if not, then the question is thrown open, When is it given? And we are not to conclude that whenever men use the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," though they may be, in external appointment, successors of the Apostles, there the gift of the Holy Ghost necessarily follows. That thus the ordained have authority given them to exercise the duties and functions of the ministry without any infraction of ecclesiastical order, and that God will receive the services of his people rendered through their ministrations, may be quite true, but that they necessarily receive such a gift as Mr. Keble supposes, is affirmed without evidence and contradicted by facts.

I know not, indeed, how we can have any right to expect more than that the Holy Spirit should give to each man severally "*as he will*;" or that we can affirm that all the declarations of our Lord and his Apostles are not fully accomplished, if, amidst all those who are admitted to the office of the ministry, the Spirit is given, *in the manner spoken of by Mr. Keble*, there only where God vouchsafes to give so great a blessing. I know of no promise that, whatever may be the character or conduct of the parties concerned, such a blessing shall be conferred in all cases where ordination is canonically performed. And the argument that, because our Lord promised his Apostles to be with them even unto the end of the world, therefore he is present with all those canonically ordained by outward succession from the Apostles, is not worth answering. To assume that our Lord in these words spake to the Apostles only as the representatives of the pastors of the Church, and not as the representatives of his disciples generally, is, to say the least, unwarranted, and to me appears much more. And thus thought Bishop Pearson, for he has expounded the promise as one applying to the

Church at large, following moreover in this the interpretation given to the passage by Leo and Augustine.¹ Equally untenable is the notion that the gift conferred upon Timothy by the imposition of St. Paul's hands must necessarily be equally conferred by any canonical ordination performed now.

In fact, as to Scriptural arguments for such a doctrine, there can be no pretence made to them. And, therefore, its supporters wisely take refuge in the Fathers, where, from their number, variety of sentiment, ignorance of the various controversies by which the Church would be agitated, rhetorical and inaccurate mode of expressing themselves, some semblance of defence may be found for almost any doctrine that can be started.

But we need not fear to meet them even here. And I would ask our opponents, where are the passages by which they can show that the Fathers held their notion on this point, that is, that ordination, where given through the strict Apostolical succession, *ensures in all cases* the gift of the Holy Spirit to abide in the ordained person for the custody of the fundamentals of doctrine and practice. I am not aware that such a doctrine was ever thought of by the primitive Fathers, and therefore until they have given some respectable testimony on the subject it is sufficient to meet their assertion with a denial.

But, as it appears to me, what is included and implied in this doctrine is of more consequence than the doctrine itself, and therefore to meet what seems to be implied, though not clearly expressed, in the statements of Mr. Keble on this point, I would direct the reader's attention to the following passages from some of the best of the Fathers, showing that, in their view,

(1) The Apostolical succession does not secure to a Church soundness in the fundamentals of the faith, and that those who have not the latter though they have the former are to be avoided.

(2) That the only absolutely essential point is *doctrinal*

¹ Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, Article ix. ed. Dobson, p. 512.

succession, or the holding the same faith the Apostles did ; and that where that faith is held, there, though perhaps labouring under irregularities and imperfections in other respects, Christ's Church is to be found, and consequently the presence of his Spirit.

1. That Apostolical succession does not secure to a Church soundness in the fundamentals of the faith, and that those who have not the latter though they have the former are to be avoided.

And all impartial readers will, I think, admit that if this is the case, then the notion, that the Apostolical succession secures in all ordinations the gift of the Holy Spirit to abide in a person for the preservation of the fundamentals, falls to the ground, whatever nice distinctions may be drawn to bolster it up.

I begin with Tertullian, whose great argument in his Treatise " De Præscript." is, that the doctrine of the Apostolical Churches, to which he refers against the heretics, was in all likelihood the true one, because those Churches *agreed together* in it, the heretics having no such argument to produce ; but if Apostolical succession is a sure test of orthodoxy in fundamentals, he would not have troubled himself to point to their agreement, but at once have put it upon the ground of their succession. Nay more, in this treatise he asks, " Do we prove the faith by persons, or persons by the faith ?" ¹ Nay, he directly affirms what we maintain, when, having spoken of the succession in the Churches of Smyrna and Rome, &c., he says, " Let the heretics make out anything like this Nay, *even if they should do so they will have done nothing. For their doctrine when compared with the Apostolical will show* from its difference and contrariety that it has neither an Apostle nor a disciple of the Apostles for its author ; for as the Apostles would not have differed from one another in their teaching, so neither would the disciples of the Apostles have preached a different doctrine to that of the Apostles, unless those who were taught by the Apostles preached otherwise than they were taught. By this test,

¹ Ex personis probamus fidem, an ex fide personas ? c. 3. p. 203.

therefore, they shall be tried by those Churches which, although they can produce no Apostle or disciple of the Apostles as their author, as being of much later origin, and such indeed are daily formed, yet *agreeing in the same faith are considered as not less Apostolical on account of the consanguinity of their doctrine.*"¹

Thus also speaks Irenæus, in a passage the beginning of which, abstracted from the context, has been quoted in favour of opposite views, but how unfairly any one who peruses the whole passage will at once see. "Wherefore," he says, "we ought to obey those presbyters who are in the Church, those I mean who have succession from the Apostles as we have shown, who with the succession of the episcopate have received according to the good pleasure of the Father the sure gift of truth But they who are looked upon by many as presbyters, but serve their own pleasures, and do not in their hearts make the fear of God their rule, but persecute others with reproaches, and are elated with pride *at their exaltation to the chief seat*, and secretly do evil, and say, 'No one seeth us,' shall be reproved by the Word. . . . *From all such it behoves us to stand aloof, and to cleave to those who, as I have said before, both retain THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLES and with the order of the presbytership [or, as others read, of a presbyter] exhibit soundness in word and a blameless conversation for the edification and correction of the rest.*"² Here, then, are evidently two sorts of

¹ Confingant tale aliquid hæretici . . . Sed etsi confinxerint, nihil promovebunt. Ipsa enim doctrina eorum cum Apostolica comparata, ex diversitate et contrarietate sua pronuntiabit, neque Apostoli alicujus auctoris esse neque Apostolici: quia sicut Apostoli non diversa inter se docuissent, ita et Apostolici non contraria Apostolis edidissent, nisi illi qui ab Apostolis didicerunt aliter prædicaverunt. Ad hanc itaque formam probabuntur ab illis Ecclesiis quæ licet nullum ex Apostolis vel Apostolicis auctorem suum proferant, ut multo posteriores, quæ denique quotidie instituuntur, tamen in eadem fide conspirantes non minus Apostolicæ deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinæ. c. 32. p. 213. So further on he says, Unde autem extranei et inimici Apostolis hæretici, nisi ex diversitate doctrinæ. c. 37. p. 216.

² Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus; qui cum episcopatus

successors of the Apostles, and from one of them we are directed to hold ourselves aloof.

Next let us hear Ambrose. "Christ," saith he, "is the only one whom no one ought under any circumstances to forsake or exchange for another." And then having bidden us seek the faith in the Church first, he adds, "in which if Christ dwells, it is beyond doubt to be chosen by us; but if an unfaithful people or an heretical teacher defiles the place, the communion of heretics is to be avoided, their place of assembly to be shunned . . . *If there is any Church which rejects the faith and does not possess the fundamentals of the doctrine of the Apostles . . . it is to be deserted.*"¹

Thus also speaks Augustine;—"We ought to find the Church, as the Head of the Church, in the holy canonical Scriptures, not to inquire for it in the various reports, and opinions, and deeds, and words, and visions of men."² "Whether they [i. e. the Donatists] hold the Church, they must show by the canonical books of the Divine Scriptures alone; for we do not say that we must be

successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt Qui vero crediti quidem sunt a multis esse presbyteri, serviunt autem suis voluptatibus, et non præponunt timorem Dei in cordibus suis, sed contumeliis agunt reliquos, et principalis consessionis tumore elati sunt, et in absconsis agunt mala et dicunt, Nemo nos videt, redarguentur a Verbo Ab omnibus igitur talibus absistere oportet; adhærere vero his qui et Apostolorum sicut prædiximus doctrinam custodiunt, et cum presbyterii [presbyteri] ordine sermonem sanum et conversationem sine offensa præstant ad informationem et correctionem reliquorum. IREN. adv. hæer. lib. iv. cc. 43, 44. pp. 343, 4. ed. Grabe.

¹ Hic [i. e. Christus] est igitur solus quem nemo debet deserere, nemo mutare. . . . Fides igitur imprimis Ecclesiæ quærenda mandatur, in qua si Christus habitator sit, haud dubie sit legenda; sin vero perfidus populus aut præceptor hæreticus deformet habitaculum, vitanda hæreticorum communio, fugienda Synagoga censetur Si qua est Ecclesia quæ fidem respuat nec Apostolicæ prædicationis fundamenta possideat, ne quam labem perfidiæ possit adspargere deserenda est. AMBROS. In Luc. lib. vi. § 68. (In c. 9, v. 4.) Tom. i. col. 1399.

² Quam [i. e. Ecclesiam] sicut ipsum caput in Scripturis sanctis canonicis debemus agnoscere, non in variis hominum rumoribus et opinionibus et factis et dictis et visis inquirere. Contr. Donat. Ep. (vulg. De unitate eccles.) c. 19. tom. ix. col. 372.

believed because we are in the Church of Christ, because Optatus of Milevi, or Ambrose of Milan, or innumerable other bishops of our communion, commended that Church to which we belong, or because it is extolled by the Councils of our colleagues, or because through the whole world in the holy places which those of our communion frequent such wonderful answers to prayer or cures happen . . . Whatever things of this kind take place in the Catholic Church are therefore to be approved of because they take place in the Catholic Church; but it is not proved to be the Catholic Church because these things happen in it. The Lord Jesus himself when he had risen from the dead . . . judged that his disciples were to be convinced by the testimonies of the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms. . . . *These are the proofs, these the foundations, these the supports of our cause.* We read in the Acts of the Apostles of some who believed, that they searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so. What Scriptures but the canonical Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets? To these have been added the Gospels, the Apostolical Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, the Apocalypse of John.”¹

Lastly, the author of the fragment of an Exposition of St. Matthew, attributed to Chrysostom, and admitted by many of the Romanists themselves to be the work of no

¹ Sed utrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant, non nisi de divinarum Scripturarum canonicis libris ostendant; quia nec nos propterea dicimus nobis credi oportere quod in Ecclesia Christi sumus, quia ipsam quam tenemus commendavit Milevitanus Optatus vel Mediolanensis Ambrosius, vel alii innumerales nostræ communionis episcopi; aut quia nostrorum collegarum conciliis ipsa prædicata est; aut quia per totum orbem in locis sanctis quæ frequentat nostra communio, tanta mirabilia vel exauditionum vel sanitatum fiunt . . . Quæcunque talia in Catholica fiunt ideo sunt approbanda, quia in Catholica fiunt; non ideo ipsa manifestatur Catholica quia hæc in ea fiunt. Ipse Dominus Jesus cum resurrexisset a mortuis . . . eos [i. e. discipulos] testimoniis Legis et Prophetarum et Psalmorum confirmandos esse judicavit . . . Hæc sunt causæ nostræ documenta, hæc fundamenta, hæc firmamenta. Legimus in Actibus Apostolorum dictum de quibusdam credentibus, quod quotidie scrutarentur Scripturas an hæc ita se haberent; quas utique Scripturas nisi canonicas Legis et Prophetarum? Huc accesserunt Evangelia, Apostolicæ Epistolæ, Actus Apostolorum, Apocalypsis Johannis. Ib. col. 372.

mean hand, speaks thus, and a very remarkable passage it is ;—It is on the words, “When ye shall see the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains,” which our author thus expounds ;—“That is, when ye shall see the impious heresy, which is the army of Antichrist, standing in the holy places of the Church, then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains ; that is, let Christians *betake themselves to the Scriptures* The mountains are the Scriptures of the Apostles or Prophets And why does he bid all Christians at that time to betake themselves to the Scriptures ? Because, at that time, when heresy hath got possession of those Churches, there can be no proof of true Christianity, nor any other refuge for Christians wishing to know the true faith, but the divine Scriptures. For before, it was shown in many ways which was the Church of Christ, and which heathenism ; but now, it is known in no way to those who wish to ascertain which is the true Church of Christ, but only through the Scriptures. Why ? Because all those things which are properly Christ’s in the truth, those heresies have also in their schism ; Churches alike, the divine Scriptures themselves alike, *bishops alike, and the other orders of the clergy*, baptism alike, the Eucharist alike, and everything else ; nay, even Christ himself [i. e. the same in name]. Therefore, if any one wishes to ascertain which is the true Church of Christ, whence can he ascertain it, in the confusion arising from so great a similitude, but only by the Scriptures ? Therefore the Lord, knowing that such a confusion of things would take place in the last days, commands, on that account, that the Christians who are in Christianity, and desirous of availing themselves of the strength of the true faith, should betake themselves to nothing else but the Scriptures. Otherwise, if they shall look to other things, they shall stumble and perish, not understanding which is the true Church. And through this they shall fall upon the

abomination of desolation, which stands in the holy places of the Church.”¹

Surely he who wrote this was a prophet indeed. Well might the Roman Inquisition put this work into their Index of prohibited books;² and rase this passage, as far as they could, by Bellarmine’s own confession, out of even the MSS.³

(2) That the only absolutely essential point is, doctrinal succession; that is, the holding the same faith the Apostles did; and that where that faith is held, there, though perhaps labouring under irregularities and imperfections in other respects, Christ’s Church is to be found, and consequently the presence of his Spirit.

¹ Id est, cum videritis hæresim impiam quæ est exercitus Antichristi stantem in locis sanctis Ecclesiæ, in illo tempore qui in Judæa sunt fugiant ad montes, id est, qui sunt in Christianitate conferant se ad Scripturas Montes autem sunt Scripturæ Apostolorum aut Prophetarum Et quare jubet in hoc tempore omnes Christianos conferre se ad Scripturas? Quia in tempore hoc, ex quo obtinuit hæresis illas ecclesias, nulla probatio potest esse veræ Christianitatis, neque refugium potest esse Christianorum aliud, volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi Scripturæ divinæ. Antea enim multis modis ostendebatur quæ esset Ecclesia Christi et quæ Gentilitas; nunc autem nullo modo cognoscitur volentibus cognoscere quæ sit vera Ecclesia Christi nisi tantummodo per Scripturas. Quare? Quia omnia hæc quæ sunt proprie Christi in veritate, habent et hæreses illæ in Schismate; similiter ecclesias, similiter et ipsas Scripturas divinas, similiter episcopos, cæterosque ordines clericorum, similiter baptismum, aliter [*similiter* or *atque* is evidently required by the context] eucharistiam et cætera omnia, denique ipsum Christum. Volens ergo quis cognoscere quæ sit vera Ecclesia Christi, unde cognoscat, in tantæ confusionis similitudinis nisi tantummodo per Scripturas? Sciens ergo Dominus tantam confusionem rerum in novissimis diebus esse futuram, ideo mandat, ut Christiani qui sunt in Christianitate volentes firmitatem accipere fidei veræ ad nullam rem fugiant nisi ad Scripturas. Alioqui si ad alia respexerint scandalizabuntur et peribunt, non intelligentes quæ sit vera Ecclesia. Et per hoc incident in abominationem desolationis quæ stat in sanctis Ecclesiæ locis. Opus Imperf. in Matth. hom. 49. Inter Chrysost. Op. Tom. 6. App. p. 204. See also hom. 43. p. 183, where he says, “Cathedra non facit sacerdotem, sed sacerdos cathedram.”

² See Index Auctorum et libr. qui ab Officio S. Rom. et Univ. Inquisit. caveri ab omnibus &c. mandantur. Rom. 1559. 4to. Under letter O.

³ De Verb. Dei, lib. iv. c. 11. This passage, also, is *omitted* in one, if not more, of the Romish editions of the book, viz., that printed Paris, 1557. 8vo. See James’s Corruption of SS. and Fathers. Part ii. n. 2. p. 168. ed. 1688.

The passages we have already quoted, clearly show that whatever regard the Fathers had for the Apostolical succession, they did not hold that its presence must be any sure indication of the presence of Apostolical doctrine; and that the former was of no value without the latter.

But it may be asked, Is the latter sufficient to make men members of the Church of Christ without the former? It is a point on which we can hardly expect to find a definite and express decision in the early Fathers, on account of the general prevalence of the episcopal form of government. But, nevertheless, there are many passages from which we may fairly infer their mind on the question.

"The Church," says Jerome, "does not depend upon walls, but upon the truth of its doctrines. *The Church is there, where the true faith is.* But about fifteen or twenty years ago, heretics possessed all the walls of the Churches here. For, twenty years ago, heretics possessed all these Churches. But THE TRUE CHURCH WAS THERE, WHERE THE TRUE FAITH WAS."¹ A good answer this, by the way, to the common question of the Romanists to the Protestant Churches, where their Church was before Luther.

Remarkable, also, is the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen on this subject, in his Encomium on Athanasius. Speaking of him as the successor of Mark in the episcopal throne of Alexandria, he says;—He was "not less the successor of Mark in his piety, than in his presidential seat; in the latter, indeed, he was very far distant from him; but, in the former, he is found next after him; *which, in truth, is properly to be considered succession. For to hold the same doctrine, is to be of the same throne; but to hold an opposite doctrine, is to be of an opposite throne. And the one has the name, but the other the reality of*

¹ *Ecclesia non parietibus consistit, sed in dogmatum veritate. Ecclesia ibi est, ubi fides vera est. Cæterum ante annos quindecim aut viginti, parietes omnes hic ecclesiarum hæretici possidebant. Ante viginti enim annos omnes ecclesias has hæretici possidebant. Ecclesia autem vera illic erat, ubi vera fides erat.* HIRRON. in Psalm. 133. (Heb. num.) v. 1.

succession. For not he who has come in by force, but he who has been forced in, is a successor; nor he who has violated the laws, but he who has been advanced legally; nor he who holds an opposite doctrine, but he who is *of the same faith.* Unless any one can thus call himself a successor, he succeeds as sickness to health, as darkness to light, as a storm to a calm, and as madness to intelligence.”¹

So the author of the commentary on Matthew above quoted says,—“Where the faith, there the Church is . . . but where the faith is not, there the Church is not.”² And again;—“He does not seem to go out of the Church who goes out bodily, but he who spiritually deserts the fundamentals of ecclesiastical truth. We have gone out from them [i. e. the heretics, whoever they were, who, he tells us, then possessed the Churches] in body, but they from us in mind. We have gone out from them in respect of place, they from us in respect of the faith. We have left with them the foundations of the walls, they have left with us the foundations of the Scriptures. We have gone out from them to human eyes, they from us in the judgment of God.”³

“Christ,” saith Ambrose, “did not deny to his dis-

¹ Ουκ ηττον της ευσεβειας η προεδριας διαδοχος· τη μεν γαρ πολλοστος απ' εκεινου, τη δε ευθυσ μετ' εκεινου ευρισκεται, ην δη και κυριως υποληπτειν διαδοχην. Το μεν γαρ ομογνωμον και ομοθρονον· το δε αντιδοxon και αντιθρονον. Και η μεν προσηγοριαν, η δε αληθειαν εχει διαδοχης. Ου γαρ ο βιασαμενος, αλλ' ο βιασθεις διαδοχος, ουδε ο παρανομησας, αλλ' ο προβληθεις εννομως· ουδε ο ταναντια δοξαζων, αλλ' ο της αυτης πιστεως. Ει μη ουτω τις λεγοι διαδοχον, ως νοσον υγιειας, και φωτος σκοτος, και ζαλην γαληνης, και συνεσεως εκστασιν. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. in Athanas. I quote it from the Benedictine edition of the works of Athanasius, tom. i. p. xciii.

² Ubi est fides, illic est ecclesia ubi autem fides non est, ibi nec ecclesia est. Opus Imp. in Matth. hom. 6. Inter Chrys. Op. tom. vi. App. p. 51.

³ Non enim ille de Ecclesia exire videtur qui corporaliter exit, sed qui spiritualiter veritatis ecclesiasticæ fundamenta relinquit. Nos enim ab illis exivimus corpore, illi autem a nobis animo. Nos ab illis exivimus loco, illi a nobis fide. Nos apud illos reliquimus fundamenta parietum, illi apud nos reliquerunt fundamenta Scripturarum. Nos ab illis egressi sumus secundum aspectum hominum, illi autem a nobis secundum iudicium Dei. Ib. hom. 46. p. 195.

ciple the favour of this name, [i. e. rock,] that he also may be called Peter, having, like the rock, unshaken constancy, even a firm faith. Strive, therefore, that thou also mayest be a rock. Therefore, seek the rock, not out of thyself, but within thyself . . . Thy rock is faith, the foundation of the Church is faith. *If thou shalt be a rock* [i. e. have firm faith] *thou shalt be in the Church*, for the Church is on the rock.”¹

Before I pass on, I would here point out to the notice of the reader, that in the appeal we make, in our controversies with the dissenters on some of the points we have been considering, to the records of the primitive Church, there is no inconsistency with our rejection of tradition as a certain witness of the oral teaching of the Apostles, however loudly we may have been accused of it. Our arguments against the dissenters in these matters do by no means, as they are charged with doing, “recoil and wound ourselves,” nor “fall to the ground.”² They are as consistent with our general views as they are in themselves valid and conclusive. The principle upon which our Church acts in this matter appears to me to be of the most simple and intelligible kind. In matters of pure doctrine she requires belief in nothing which is not, in her view, clearly testified in Scripture, while she appeals to the writings of the early Christian Fathers as affording a testimony strongly confirmatory of her interpretation of Scripture. In matters relating to rites and usages, for all that she puts forward as *intrinsically* necessary, she refers to Scripture as the proof of their being divinely or Apostolically appointed; and, as in the last case, points to the records of the early Church as affording confirma-

¹ Discipulo suo hujus vocabuli gratiam non negavit; ut et ipse sit Petrus, quod de petra habeat soliditatem constantiæ, fidei firmitatem. Enitere ergo ut et tu petra sis. Itaque non extra te sed intra te petram require . . . Petra tua fides est, fundamentum Ecclesiæ fides est. Si petra fueris, in Ecclesia eris, quia Ecclesia supra petram est. AMBROS. Expos. Luc. lib. vi. § 98. (In c. 9. v. 21.) Op. tom. i. col. 1407.

² Eyre's Reply to Churton, pp. 112, 116.

tory evidence to the validity of the proof derived from Scripture; and in other points, where she refers to the practice of the orthodox primitive Church as a justification of her usage, she points to it only as a *justification* of it, and not as if the fact of their observance in the primitive Church rendered them *intrinsically* necessary; but a sufficient justification and recommendation of those rites she does consider the usage of the *Apostolically primitive* Church to be, because it cannot fairly be supposed that they would have been generally observed at that very early period if they had been unaccordant with the spirit of true Christianity, and consequently, that not only was she justified in requiring their observance, but dissenters were not justified in making such matters a ground for separation.

But that our opponents and the Romanists are inconsistent with themselves, may be very easily shown. For they put forward the statements of a few Fathers as giving of themselves sufficient evidence of the Apostolical origin and authority of various doctrines and practices not recorded in Scripture. I ask, then, why they do not receive some which we have already proved¹ to have that evidence in their favour, as for instance, besides doctrines, the following practices, namely, standing at prayer on Sundays, and during the period between Easter and Whitsuntide, the threefold immersion in baptism, and infant communion?

It would be easy to add others to the list, but these may suffice here.²

Our opponents will perhaps reply to these cases, that we cannot give sufficient evidence of antiquity, universality, and consent; and they may save themselves the trouble of *proving* it, for we grant it at once, not dreaming of being able to prove in *any* matter what *everybody always everywhere* said or did respecting it; and all we

¹ See Vol. I. pp. 409, et seq., particularly pp. 421-4.

² See Basil, or Pseudo-Basil, De Spir. Sancto, c. 27; and Morton's Cath. App. ii. 25. § 10, pp. 324, 5.

ask in return is, that they shall strike off their list of "Apostolical relics" all that have no better evidence, and we shall then have very little left to dispute about.

We now come to the points purely doctrinal for which it is said that we are indebted to tradition.

Here, then, at the outset, we must remark, that if our reasoning hitherto has been correct, it follows, that if these doctrines depend upon patristical tradition, they are not binding upon the conscience, inasmuch as they have no sufficient evidence that they are a part of revealed truth.

But we must not pass them over without notice; and to the two latter, as more peculiarly belonging to the controversy raised by our opponents, I shall have to call the reader's especial attention.

The first is the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

To discuss this doctrine fully, and show the precise meaning of the language of the Fathers respecting it, would require far more space than we can here allot to it. Nor is it at all necessary in this place, for, after the observations of Dr. Pusey respecting it, it is somewhat extraordinary to see it so adduced. For Dr. Pusey thinks that it is "the obvious meaning of Scripture," and says that "with one who loved his Saviour he should be content to rest the question upon one passage," namely, John iii. 5. (Preface to Tract on Baptism, p. vii.) If, then, it is so clear in Scripture, it does *not* rest upon "tradition," and therefore certainly can be no proof of the necessity of tradition, or the imperfection in any sense of Scripture. Upon Dr. Pusey's own showing, then, it has no place in the question we are now discussing. I shall only add, that by those who think that it is not clearly provable by Scripture, it is *at least* not maintainable as a *certain* truth, a truth of which we have sufficient evidence that it was divinely revealed.

In the case of infant baptism, which was a point referring to ecclesiastical *practice*, we might, perhaps, infer

with safety, from the statements of the early records of the Church, that infant-baptism was practised in the *Apostolically-primitive* Church, and hence that the Scriptural doctrine of baptism included infants as its subjects; but the point in question is one of pure doctrine, referring to the spiritual and unseen effects of baptism, and therefore differently circumstanced.

The difference between the two cases is apparent; for, to give an instance, our opponents on the one hand, and those who take the Calvinistic view of the subject on the other, would both be equally trustworthy witnesses of the fact, that the Church of England practised infant baptism, while nevertheless, on this doctrine of baptismal regeneration, they are altogether disagreed as to what is the doctrine of that Church, which shows how different is the validity of such testimony, where the practice of the Church is concerned, and where doctrines are concerned.

The next instance given is,—

The virtue of the eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice.

These words, however, require further explanation to show the meaning in which they are used; for though from the connexion here maintained between “the *virtue* of the eucharist,” and its being *a sacrifice*, one might perhaps infer the doctrine intended, yet the word sacrifice is used so variously, *and may in some sense be so properly applied to the eucharist*, that it is necessary to ascertain more fully what is meant by the words used.

In the 81st of the “Tracts for the times,” then, (which is on this subject, and professes to give a Catena of English divines favourable to the views of the Tractators,) the doctrine is thus stated. Admitting that there are in our Church-services but “*slight indications*” of the doctrine, which the writer ingeniously attributes to “the ‘*disciplina arcani*’ of the Anglican Church” (!), though he thinks that the placing it so out of sight was to “tamper” with “the Apostolic deposit of sound words,” he avers that “our Church retains” “the doctrine of a

sacrifice in the Blessed Eucharist," (p. 2.) which, in a sense, nobody disputes, and then adds this description of it. "It may be well, however, in these days, before going further, to state briefly what that doctrine is The doctrine, then, of the early Church was this; that 'in the Eucharist an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to God, under the form of his creatures of bread and wine, according to our blessed Lord's holy institution, in memory of his cross and passion;' and this they believed to be the 'pure offering' or sacrifice which the prophet Malachi foretold that the Gentiles should offer; and that it was enjoined by our Lord in the words, 'Do this for a memorial of me'; that it was alluded to when our Lord or St. Paul speak of a Christian 'altar,' (St. Matt. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 10,) and was typified by the Passover, which was both a sacrifice, and a feast upon a sacrifice.¹ This commemorative oblation or sacrifice they doubted not to be acceptable to God who had appointed it; and so to be also a means of bringing down God's favour *upon the whole Church*. And if we were to analyze their feelings in our way, how should it be otherwise, when they *presented to the Almighty Father the symbols and memorials of the meritorious death and passion of his only begotten and well beloved Son, and besought him by that precious sacrifice to look graciously upon the Church* which he had purchased with his own blood—offering the memorials of that same sacrifice which he, our great high priest, made once for all, and now being entered within the veil, unceasingly presents before the Father; and the representation of which he has commanded us to make? It is, then, to use our technical phraseology, 'a commemorative impetratory sacrifice' The Eucharist, then, according to them, consisted of two parts, a 'commemorative sacrifice,' and a 'communion,' or communion; THE FORMER OBTAINING REMISSION OF SINS FOR THE CHURCH; the communion, 'the strengthening and

¹ This is a mere repetition of the arguments of Dr. Hickes, in his "Christian Priesthood asserted," and Johnson, in his "Unbloody Sacrifice."

refreshing of the soul,' although, inasmuch as it united the believer with Christ, it *indirectly* conveyed remission of sins *too*. The communion was (to use a modern phrase) the feast upon *the sacrifice thus offered* As being, moreover, appointed by their Lord, they believed that the continual oblation of this sacrifice (*like the daily sacrifice appointed in the elder Church*) was a benefit to *the whole Church*, independently and over and above the benefit to the individual communicants—that the sacrifices in each branch of the Christian Church were mutually of benefit to every other branch, each to all and all to each Lastly . . . they felt assured that *THIS sacrifice offered by the Church on earth for the whole Church, conveyed to that portion of the Church which had passed into the unseen world such benefits of Christ's death as (their conflicts over, and they in rest) were still applicable to them;*" such benefits being supposed to be, among others, "additional joys and satisfactions." (pp. 4—7.)

And the time when this sacrifice is offered up is, AFTER the consecration of the bread and wine, when they may be considered more peculiarly to represent the body and blood of Christ, the act of placing the bread and wine upon the Table being distinguished as an oblation of these elements to God, for the purpose of their being AFTERWARDS used for the sacrifice. (pp. 35, 36.) And the sacrifice is made by the priest in a strictly sacerdotal capacity, for the following language is quoted with approbation,—“the Church of England considering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a feast upon a sacrifice, to constitute it such, *makes that which is feasted upon first a sacrifice, by having it offered up by a priest.*” (p. 53.)

These extracts (it will, I suppose, be allowed) give a fair representation of the doctrine of our opponents; and while it is admitted that some portions of them may be understood in a good sense, from the different way in which the terms employed have been applied, (which has enabled the author of this tract to make a parade of authors as maintaining it who would have abhorred his

doctrine,) the doctrine here taught is clearly this,—That besides an oblation of the elements, as bread and wine, to serve the purpose of making a memorial of Christ's sacrifice, there is in the eucharist, properly celebrated, a second oblation, or solemn offering up to God of the elements, to be made *after* the act of consecration has given them the character of symbols of Christ's body and blood;¹ and this second oblation is a true and proper sacrifice to be made by the minister in a strictly sacerdotal character; and by this sacrifice is obtained (not, indeed, by its *intrinsic* merits, but the merits of that sacrifice which it represents) remission of sins for the whole Church, and some additional refreshment to the souls of the dead in the intermediate state.

Remission of sins is thus obtained for the Church through the priest offering up to God as a mediator and intercessor between God and the people, a sacrifice commemorative of the sacrifice of the cross, just as was the case in the expiatory sacrifices under the Old Testament.² And the "communion" is no part of the sacrifice, but *only* a feast upon the sacrifice, and remission of sins is obtained for *the whole Church* without it, although, "inasmuch as it unites the believer with Christ, it *indirectly* conveys remission of sins too."

Such is the doctrine which our opponents maintain to be the doctrine of the Church of England derived to us from "tradition," or the unanimous consent of antiquity; and I most willingly admit that we should look for it in vain in

¹ Thus Collier, the Nonjuror, says,—“The word *oblations* in this prayer [the prayer for the Church militant] means no more than the offering of the unconsecrated bread and wine;” but “*the eucharistic oblation*,” he says, “is the offering of the *consecrated* elements, the sacramental body and blood of our Saviour, in memory of his sacrifice and passion.” See Shepherd on the Common Prayer, vol. ii. p. 193.

² Hence it is here represented as a true and proper *propitiatory* sacrifice, (as it was called by Johnson, the Nonjuror,) that is, as much so as any of the sacrifices of the Old Testament; though, from its being only instrumentally and not intrinsically propitiatory, as an instrument for applying the merits of that sacrifice of Christ of which it is commemorative, the word is sometimes objected to; and it is called only an *impetratory* sacrifice, that is, one which obtains for man instrumentally the benefits of that sacrifice which it represents.

Scripture. And when the Tractator comes to speak of the Romish doctrine as distinct from the Anglican, he makes the difference to consist merely¹ in the doctrine that in the mass Christ is as truly and really sacrificed as he was upon the cross, "that Christ himself is again offered." So that by his own statements his doctrine on this subject would appear to be, what indeed it is, the Romish doctrine of *the sacrifice of the Mass*, that is, as far as concerns the offerer, the mode of offering, and the effects produced.

To prove his doctrine to be that of the Anglican Church, he has introduced in this Tract a long Catena of extracts from English divines, claimed by him as maintainers of this doctrine. To notice this Catena in full does not fall within our present limits, but it is impossible to dismiss it without a remark, and by the fidelity and trustworthiness of this Catena we may judge of the value of our opponents' statements respecting the Fathers.

The Tractators are quite aware how little ecclesiastical studies have prevailed until very lately among the great majority, and they have largely availed themselves of the *supposed* superficial knowledge of the generality on such subjects, and their want of acquaintance with the works of our great divines, and would fain lead us to suppose that the views of such men as Brett, Johnson, and Hickes, were the views of all our best theologians, though, in the subject before us more especially, they have, I suspect, gone beyond what *some* even of these authors would have been inclined to maintain, for it is a vastly different thing to maintain the propriety of the elements being solemnly offered up to God after their consecration as a sacrifice commemorative of the sacrifice of the cross, and to *connect* with such oblation the doctrine which our opponents connect with it. Such an attempt will, I trust, meet only with the success it deserves. But alas! such views are so gratifying to the pride of human nature in the clergy,

¹ He adds, that they have corrupted the true doctrine by the error of purgatory, but that is a distinct question.

that it is not to be wondered at if they should find many supporters.

We have already observed that there are senses in which the word sacrifice may very properly be applied to the eucharist. The whole action of the eucharist is a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and such "sacrifice of praise," (Heb. xiii. 15,) as being a sacrifice of the heart, is one more acceptable to God than any material or external offering.

Moreover, the elements themselves may be called a sacrifice to God, not as things offered up as a propitiatory sacrifice to God, but as things given and set apart for the service of God.¹ Thus Cyprian rebukes the wealthy for coming to Church "without a sacrifice," and "taking part of the sacrifice which the poor offered;"² it being customary then for the bread and wine to be brought by the communicants.

So also the consecrated elements might be called a sacrifice *figuratively*, as they *represent* and symbolically set forth the sacrifice of Christ; although it is evident, from the deductions of our opponents from such language, that it is inconvenient and dangerous phraseology, however harmless in its original use and signification.

Hence the doctrine maintained by any writer must be gathered, not from the bare use of certain terms, but from the meaning attached to them in his writings.

In this Tract, however, we have a vast heap of names and extracts strung together without the slightest notice

¹ Waterland seems to object to the word sacrifice being at all applied to the elements, and hence opposes the notion of any *material* sacrifice in the eucharist, but if sacrifice be understood in the larger sense of the word, so as to include even the offerings of prayer and praise, as Waterland himself uses it, I see not why we should not allow the bread and wine used in God's service to be so called. The reader will observe, that in that sense of the word *sacrifice*, in which alone it is applicable under the Christian dispensation, it is only equivalent to the word *oblation*; and the two, therefore, are used indiscriminately by the Fathers.

² Locuples et dives es, et dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ carbonam omnino non respicis, quæ in dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quæ partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulit sumis? Cypr. De op. et eleemos. circ. med. Ed. Pamel.

of the different senses in which the word sacrifice has been used by them, or of the difference of *doctrine* in those who have used alike certain *words* and *names*, and find Hooker and Johnson the Nonjuror placed side by side so as to lead the unsuspecting reader to suppose that the "sacrifice" of the one was precisely the same as the "sacrifice" of the other; and in fact, whatever divines have used the word sacrifice in connexion with the eucharist seem to have been forthwith set down (with few exceptions) as supporters of *the Tractators' view* of "the Eucharistic sacrifice."

Now the writer of this Tract (if at least he is as learned as the professions of the Tractators would lead us to suppose) must have been perfectly aware that many of the authors whom he has here quoted would have utterly repudiated and reprobated the views of which he here quotes them as supporters. I will just give one instance by which the reader may judge of the fidelity and value of this Tract. The third author quoted in this Catena, as supporting the views of our opponents on this question, is Hooker, and the proof is, that in one place he has said that the cup serveth for a sacrifice of thanksgiving. Now so far is Hooker from supporting the views of our opponents, that he distinctly says, not far from the passage quoted,—"*Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applyeth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech call usually the ministry of the gospel priesthood, in regard of that which the gospel hath proportionable to antient sacrifices, namely the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice . . . in truth the word presbyter doth seem more fit and in propriety of speech more agreeable than*

priest with the drift of the whole gospel of Jesus Christ." (v. 78.) With this passage before him the author of this Tract has placed Hooker upon his Catena for their doctrine of the sacrifice of the Eucharist; a passage which Waterland, who is accused by the Tract writer (p. 51) of taking too low a view of this doctrine, (he, in fact, denied *in toto* that for which our opponents are contending, viz. a *material* sacrifice in the bread and wine) charges with going too far, and wishes to understand in a limited sense, as Mr. Keble is aware, as he has quoted it in his edition of Hooker, in a note on the passage. (vol. ii. p. 601.)

And after Hooker, and others *equally opposed with him to the views of our opponents*, come such men as Brett and Johnson and Hickes, whose views are so notoriously opposed to those of the great majority of our divines, and even of those quoted in this Catena, and whose meaning, therefore, when speaking of the sacrifice in the Eucharist is so different to that of others who may have used the same term on the subject, (a term used and insisted on by Beza himself,¹ and to which in some sense *not a creature objects*,) that one can only say that if the writer of the Tract in question is as learned as we are taught to suppose, he must be a *bold* man. In so speaking, indeed, I am suppressing nine-tenths of the feeling with which every candid mind must view the matter.

But, as the author of this Tract is well aware, the matter is so entangled by the different meanings affixed to the terms used, and by the controversial writings of most of our divines on the subject having been replies to Romanists, and consequently mixed up with the question of transubstantiation, that it is difficult to show, by a few brief extracts, what the doctrine of our divines on this subject was; clearly as it may be seen in their works, taken as a whole. To those works, therefore, I must, for want of space, be content here to refer the reader; and the case

¹ See Waterland's *Christian Sacrifice explained*. Works, vol. viii. p. 161.

of Hooker, already given, may show him the need of such a reference.¹

That our Church, in her public services, gives any countenance to the doctrine here maintained, is, as we have seen, all but given up. And it is curious to observe the way in which the Tractator attempts to get over this difficulty. In the first prayer-book of Edward VI., there was inserted in the prayer of consecration, after that which now remains, an address to God, in which our opponents hold that the consecrated elements were offered up to him in that sacrificial way for which they plead; which, in the revised prayer-book, was OMITTED; and a part which followed it was ordered, as now, to be used as a distinct prayer *after the communion*. For this alteration, which, if the views of our opponents are correct, involves a vital departure from the instituted mode of celebrating the ordinance, (for, by this sacrifice so *omitted*, remission of sins is obtained for the Church,) our opponents are, of course, driven to their wits' end to find a reason consistent with the supposition that our Church, in her services, and our Reformers who drew them up as they now stand, maintain their views. And accordingly all is attributed to the weakness of Cranmer in listening to foreign advisers, and, at their instigation, *half* suppressing (for, of course, it would not do to allow that it was wholly suppressed,) the doctrine of the sacrifice, and leaving the communion service in this vitally defective state; *in which state, be it remembered, our divines for three centuries have been content to leave it*. But the Tractator thinks that "the restoration of the communion table [on the accession

¹ It is through the variety of senses attached to the words used, that the Tractator gets over that passage in our Homilies, in which we are exhorted to "take heed lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice." The meaning of this passage, to an ordinary reader, and especially one acquainted with the language of our services, would seem plain enough. But the Tractator, by assuming that the writer of the homily meant by sacrifice, the real sacrifice supposed in transubstantiation, interprets this passage to mean that we must take heed lest of a *commemorative sacrifice* it be made a real sacrifice, such as transubstantiation would make it. See Tract 81. pp. 43, 4.

of Queen Elizabeth] to the place which the altar had formerly occupied, showed that the Church recognized the doctrine which some of her heads had before *shrunk from avowing in the presence of the foreign Reformers, and their disciples*," (p. 19,) though this was, he admits, but a *half avowal*. (p. 20.) And hence Edward VI.'s first book is called "the *genuine* English service book." (p. 23.) And we are told that the revisers of our Liturgy "confined the verbal act of the sacrifice to the single prayer which followed after the consecration," (p. 12,) that is, the prayer *after the communion*; so that the act of sacrifice now takes place *after the sacrifice has been CONSUMED*. If this is the *half* that remains of the doctrine of the sacrifice in our service, the reader will not, probably, be disposed to think it the better half. And our Tractator seems sometimes of the same opinion; unless it is by a slip of the pen that he has written, (speaking of the alterations made in the revision of the Prayer-book,) "All the beginning of the form of oblation was omitted . . . The remainder 'entirely desiring,' &c. was placed (*mutatis mutandis*) after the delivery of the elements, and consequently when their presence could no longer sanction in any mind the idea of the actual offering up of Christ," and therefore, I suppose, not of any *emblematical offering up of Christ*; for the transposition affected one as much as the other. (p. 31.) But our Tractator will have it, that "that portion of the prayer of consecration, which has been transposed and placed *after the actual communion*," is an "indication of the doctrine of the sacrifice;" for "the sense must remain the same, although its meaning is *less visible*, on account of its being disconnected from the actual visible elements, EXCEPT SO FAR AS A PORTION OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS STILL REMAINS UPON THE ALTAR, whence it is recorded that *Bishop Overall used it before the participation, as it was at first*." (pp. 35, 36.)¹ So that although the elements may be all consumed when the prayer is uttered, this only makes the reference of

¹ See also Tract 90. p. 60.

the prayer to a solemn offering up of them to God, "*less visible*;" and perchance, adds the Tractator, there may be "*a portion* of the consecrated elements still remaining upon the altar," so that it may be considered as an offering up of *these unconsumed fragments*; and so much does the service indicate this view, that Bishop Overall was obliged to break the rubric, and alter the service, to make it do so. Such is the plain English of this passage. Alas! for the shifts to which the love of a theory will drive men! The reader will observe, also, that all this is maintained in the face of an acknowledged omission of the only part in the first prayer-book that had any direct reference to the oblation or sacrifice contended for; and the retention of that part only that refers to the sacrifice of *praise and thanksgiving*, which is directed to be said, as if to put the meaning out of all question, *after the communion is over*.

The only other argument that I can find adduced in proof of the retention of the doctrine of the sacrifice in our present service, (taken, that is, from the service itself,) is that "the preamble in the prayer of consecration" "implies the sacrifice," because it speaks of our continuing "*a perpetual memory*" of Christ's precious death, (p. 35); which we are to understand as signifying, contrary to the obvious meaning of the words, and contrary to the very significant *omission* of the sacrificial part of the service, *that commemorative sacrifice* for which our opponents contend. This argument I leave with the reader.

Our Church countenances no such sacrifice of the consecrated elements to God; but in the place of it, the offering up, by faith, of the true sacrifice of the cross upon the altar of the heart, in our prayers and praises, while we receive outwardly and corporally the emblems of that sacrifice; emblems which, in the case of every faithful worshipper, are accompanied with a direct spiritual influence and blessing, uniting the believer with Christ the Head.

It would have been much more to the credit of the Tractator, if he had fairly allowed, with his own witness,

Mede, that there was no such sacrifice countenanced in our Church service. Mede, indeed, fairly admits, not only that there is no *such* sacrifice (for he does not seem to plead for *such* a sacrifice,) but that our Church did not, at that time, distinctly recognize any sacrifice at all; and the character of the oblation or sacrifice, for which he contends, is clearly shown, when he says that, "in deed and effect we do it, so often as we set the bread and wine upon the holy table; *for*, whatsoever we set upon God's table, is, ipso facto, *dedicated and offered unto him*;"¹ and so much, perhaps, the word "oblations," *afterwards introduced*,² in the prayer for the Church militant, may appear to sanction; but this would be far from countenancing the doctrine of our opponents, which can be satisfied with nothing less than an oblation of the elements *after* consecration, when they have been set apart as sacramentally the body and blood of Christ; and thus are considered to be available, when offered by a priest, for the remission of the sins of the whole Church. And so again, he says elsewhere, "There is nothing wanting to make this sacred *epulum*, of which we speak, full out a sacrifice, but that we show, That the viands thereof were *first offered unto God*; that so being his, he might be the *Convivator*, Man the *conviva*, or the guest. And this the antient Church was wont to do; this they believed our blessed Saviour himself did, when, at the institution of this holy rite, he took the bread and the cup into his sacred hands, and looking up to heaven, gave thanks and blessed. And, after his example, they first *offered the bread and wine unto God to agnize him the Lord of the creature*, and then received them from him again in a banquet, as the symbols of the body and blood of his Son."³ But this sacrifice is one of a very different kind to that which our opponents would introduce. And when he afterwards speaks of Christ being offered in the Eucharist commemoratively, he explains himself to mean

¹ Tract. p. 122. Works, p. 376.

² At the review in 1661.

³ Works, pp. 372, 3.

that, "by this sacred RITE of bread and wine, we represent and inculcate his blessed passion to his Father;"¹ by which words, and his language elsewhere, it is evident that he means that, by the whole Eucharistical act, we represent Christ's passion to the Father; not that the minister offers up, as a priest, the consecrated bread and wine as a propitiatory sacrifice to the Father. And this clearly follows from the laudatory way in which he has quoted the following passage from Perkins. "The ancient Fathers used to call the supper of the Lord, or *the whole action of the supper*, a sacrifice; and that for divers reasons . . . Because it is a commemoration and also a representation unto God the Father of the sacrifice of Christ offered upon the cross In this sense the faithful, *in their prayers, do offer Christ* as a sacrifice unto God the Father for their sins, in being wholly carried away in their minds and affections unto that only and true sacrifice, *thereby to procure and obtain God's favour to them*;" to which Mede adds, "That which every Christian doth mentally and vocally, when he commends his prayers to God the Father, through Jesus Christ, making mention of his death and satisfaction; that in the public service of the Church was done by that rite, which our Saviour commanded to be used in commemoration of him."² By which he evidently means that it is done in the public service, not by the priest merely, but by all present; not as if this sacrifice was a propitiatory sacrifice to be offered only by the priest, to obtain remission of sins for the people, distinct from the communion to be participated in by the people. The doctrine of Mede, therefore, is at least very different to that of the Tractators on the subject.

Accordingly we find that our opponents' friend and chosen witness, Dr. Brett, very distinctly charges the Church of England with a vital omission in her eucharistic service. I will transcribe some of his observations on

¹ Chap. 9, p. 376.

² Mede's Works, pp. 365, 366.

this matter, and commend his *fair* and *open* dealing to the attention and imitation of the Tractators.

“I wish,” says Dr. Brett, “where he [*i. e.* Johnson] could have shewed us where the Church of England has appointed such an oblation of the sacramental body and blood of Christ, as he speaks of, . . . or that she has not *wilfully* and *designedly* omitted it. *That it is omitted* in the communion office of the Church of England, is *evident* to all that are acquainted with that Liturgy; and that it was not *casually*, but *wilfully*, left out there, is no less evident, because not only in the Roman Canon . . . but also in the first reformed Liturgy of King Edward VI. there was such an oblation immediately following the words of institution . . . but in the second Liturgy of King Edward, and ever since, this prayer (that is, what the second reformers thought fit to *leave of it*) has been removed to the post-communion, that it might not be used till after the elements were distributed and consumed . . . The words ‘to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving’ . . . as they are now placed in the post-communion *can by no means be applied to the material elements. For it is absurd to pretend that we may offer to God that which is not, or present to him that which we have eaten and consumed.* . . . This omission and transposition could not be made otherwise than with design. Consequently, the Church of England has wilfully and designedly omitted to make the oblation of the sacramental body and blood of Christ; and therefore, according to what Mr. Johnson says, she is *without excuse* as to this matter. . . . If it be but a very great defect, it ought to be corrected; and if it is an *essential* one, it is of *fatal consequence*. And *surely it is essential* if it be what our Saviour did and commanded us to do, as Mr. Johnson has proved it is, and the very words of institution teach us, and the practice of the whole Church, from the Apostles’ days to the Reformation, has been agreeable thereto.”¹

¹ Brett’s Collection of ancient Liturgies. Dissert. pp. 119—22.

How far our opponents agree in reality in these views, may be seen in Mr. Froude's *Remains*, Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Fausset, and Mr. Keble's Preface to Hooker. By Mr. Froude it is said that our present communion service is "a judgment on the Church," and that there would be gain in "replacing it by a good translation of the Liturgy of St. Peter" (a euphemism for the mass book); by Mr. Newman, that our reformers, in not adopting "the Canon of the mass," which is called a "sacred and most precious monument of the Apostles," "mutilated the tradition of 1500 years," and that "our present condition is a judgment on us for what they did;"¹ and by Mr. Keble, that our reformers, in their revision of the Prayer Book, have "given up altogether the ecclesiastical tradition regarding certain *very material* points in the celebration, if not in the doctrine, of the Holy Eucharist."² And yet, notwithstanding this, they publish a Tract, in which they endeavour to prove that our Communion service may be explained so as to be consistent with their views, and claim all the best of our English divines as supporters of them!

I now proceed to the question whether the doctrine of our opponents on this point, is that of the Scriptures or the primitive Church.

In this doctrine are contained the four following propositions:—

1st. That the bread and wine, *after* consecration, are to be offered up to God by the minister, as a sacrifice commemorative of the sacrifice of the cross.

2dly. That the minister performs this act in a strictly sacerdotal character.

3dly. That by *this* sacrifice so offered by a priest, remission of sins is obtained for the whole Church.

4thly. That by this sacrifice so offered an additional

¹ Newman's Lett. to Dr. Fausset, 2nd ed. pp. 46, 7.

² Pref. to Hooker, p. 62.

refreshment is obtained for the souls of the dead in the intermediate state.

All these four propositions, then, we maintain to be contrary to the testimony of Scripture and the earliest Fathers.

1st. That the bread and wine, *after* consecration, are to be offered up to God by the minister, as a sacrifice commemorative of the sacrifice of the cross.

Whether there is any intrinsic evil in such an oblation of the elements, is not here the question. That the bread and wine, after that they have obtained by consecration a peculiar character, as things set apart as emblems of Christ's body and blood, should be solemnly offered up to God as a memorial, as it were, to God of the sacrifice of the cross, *may* not be *in itself* an improper act. And by this act, the body and blood of Christ might be said to be offered up, that is *figuratively* and *symbolically*, which is the only way in which they could be offered up by elements which, as the Fathers testify, are still bread and wine. And this was perhaps done by some in the fourth century, but was done simultaneously and correspondently, as far as the succession of time would admit, with that *act of the heart* by which the true body and blood of Christ—the true sacrifice of the cross—were spiritually offered up to the Father in prayers and praises, as the only propitiation for our sins; which spiritual sacrifice is that which at all times is, as it were, the soul of the service, and that upon which its value altogether depends. But though the offering up of the consecrated symbols may not be *in itself* improper, yet there are objections to it, and our Church has thus judged. We have not either the testimony of Scripture, or of the primitive Church, in its favour. And there is no inconsiderable danger, as I think facts teach us, that this external offering made through the hands of the minister, may be substituted for that spiritual offering up of the sacrifice of the cross upon the altar of the heart of each individual, upon

which the value of the service to the individual communicant wholly depends. Nay more; as we have no authority for so doing, it is an act which appears to savour strongly of presumption.

First, as it respects Scripture.

The Tractator tells us that the Fathers declare "that it [the sacrifice] was enjoined by our Lord in the words 'Do this for a memorial of me.'" I suppose he means Father Bellarmine and such like, for he will find, I suspect, no others; nor is it necessary to do more than place before him the observations of *his own witness*, Bishop Morton, not far from the passage he has quoted on this point. "To this purpose, he [*i. e.* Bellarmine], as others, insisteth upon the same words, *hoc facite*, saying, that 'Christ offered a sacrifice, and commanded it to be offered certainly in these words, *hoc facite*, *do this*, where the word *hoc*, this, doth demonstrate that which Christ did in the supper, viz., to sacrifice himself.' Which is so empty and pithless a proof that their own Jansenius, as it were, despairing of the issue, doth say that 'notwithstanding this sacrifice cannot be effectually proved by this text of *hoc facite*, yet may it be proved by tradition.' Which causeth us to admire our adversaries' vain pretences who profess to expound Scriptures according to the consent of antient Fathers, and yet now their greatest doctor, Cardinal Bellarmine, when he contendeth for their great Diana, the Romish sacrifice of the Mass, and would prove it out of the words *hoc facite*, doth not out of all the catalogue of antient Fathers, cite any one that we find who interpreteth *facite* to be *sacrificate*. Neither indeed can it be so enforced: for as their Cardinal Jansenius truly noteth, the pronoun *hoc*, *this*, 'is to be referred not only to the taking of the eucharist, but unto all those particulars which Christ is said forthwith to have done; as namely, the taking bread, giving of thanks, blessing, and breaking, &c.'"¹

¹ Morton's Catholic Appeal, ii. 7. §§ 10, 11. pp. 177, 8. I would commend the whole of this chapter to the attention of the reader, and also his Treatise

"The plea from *hoc facite*," says Dr. Waterland, "when first set up, was abundantly answered by a very learned Romanist; I mean the excellent Picherell, who wrote about 1562, and died in 1590. Protestants also¹ have often confuted it, and the Papists themselves, several of them, have long ago given it up. The other boasted plea drawn from the use of the present tense, in the words of the institution, has been so often refuted and exposed,² that I cannot think it needful to call that matter over again in an age of so much light and learning."³

So that in these words at least we have no intimation of any such sacrifice.

"Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," or as it was styled in the second and enlarged edition of 1652, "Of the Lord's Supper;" for though, from his controversy being with those who held the doctrine of Transubstantiation, his observations are not all strictly applicable to our present subject, yet they evidently *include* a defence of the view for which we are here contending. "As for the Protestants," he says, "they, in their divine and public service, do profess Christ the Son of God to be *the only true priest* of the New Testament; who, being God and man, was only able to work in himself propitiation with God for man; and his sacrifice once offered upon the cross to be the all and only sufficient sacrifice for the remission of sins; WHICH [i. e. *which sacrifice of the cross*] by an eucharistical and thankful commemoration (according unto the acknowledged tenour of antient Liturgies, 'for all the faithful, whether martyrs, patriarchs, prophets, or Apostles, and all saints) *they* present unto God as an effectual propitiation, both for the quick and the dead; *by the which* PRAYERS [so that the *prayers* offered by the heart are the *commemoration* outwardly betokened by the bread and wine] they apply *the same* propitiatory sacrifice unto the good of *all that are capable*." (Cath. App. ii. 7. § 18. p. 188.) Here, then, we clearly see that the true altar recognized by Bishop Morton, is the altar of the heart, from which, in the sacrifices of prayer and praise, Christ is offered up to the Father as an effectual propitiation, and his effectual propitiation is offered up by the communicants not only for themselves, but for the whole Church, including also even the dead, *so far* as to intercede for their future happy resurrection and possession of the promised inheritance, *the only prayers for them which, as Bishop Morton himself tells us, in the following chapter, (§ 2. p. 190,) pure antiquity sanctions.*

¹ J. Forbes, p. 616. Morn. p. 212. Salmas. contr. Grot. p. 444. Albertin. p. 498, 509. Morton, b. vi. c. 1. p. 390. Townson, p. 276. Brevint, Depth and myst. p. 128. Payne, p. 9 & s. Pfaff, p. 186, 220, 259, 269.

² Picherell, p. 62, 138. Spalatens. p. 278. Mason, p. 614. Morton, b. vi. c. 1. p. 394. Albertin. p. 74, 76, 78, 119. J. Forbes, p. 617. Brevint, p. 128. Kidder & Payne. Pfaff. p. 232, 233.

³ Appendix to Christian Sacrifice. Works, vol. 8. pp. 194, 5.

That "the early Church" held that the Eucharist was "alluded to when our Lord or St. Paul speak of a Christian altar (St. Matt. v. 23: Heb. xiii. 10)", cannot be proved by anything bearing the appearance of patristical consent, so that even Bellarmine himself admits that it cannot be so urged,¹ and affirms that the Apostles and writers of the New Testament, by the special guidance of the Holy Ghost, purposely forbore to insert in their writings the name of an altar;² and the passage in the Hebrews is generally interpreted as referring to *the altar of the cross*, a phrase which Waterland has shown to have been in common use with the Fathers.³ But even if it could, (and some of the Fathers have given that interpretation,) we reply with their own witness on this subject, Bishop Morton, "Grant that altar doth as naturally and necessarily infer a sacrifice as a shrine doth a saint, a father a son; yet so, as to distinguish when these things are properly and when *improperly* so called; knowing that the table of the Lord being called improperly an altar can no more conclude a sacrifice properly understood, than when as St. Paul calleth Titus, his son according to the faith, (which is improperly,) a man may contend that St. Paul was his proper and natural father, which is, according to the flesh."⁴

Now, we grant that the Lord's table may be called *improperly* an altar, on several accounts, and therefore, the mere use of the word proves nothing in favour of the doctrine of our opponents. For though it may be quite true that according to their notion the altar is only *improperly* an altar, yet it is *also* true in our view of the subject, and therefore, the mere name proves no more for their view than for ours. And we readily admit that these words, altar, priest, sacrifice, were used in the Church at a very early period, though not perhaps at the earliest. Bellarmine himself states that the first Christians abstained from the use of such words up to the time

¹ De miss. lib. 1. c. 14. ² Ib. c. 17. ³ Works, vol. 8. p. 211, 12.

⁴ Cath. App. ii. 6. § 1. p. 162.

of Tertullian;¹ and hence Bishop Morton justly observes, "If, therefore, some Protestants, calling to mind the temperance of the primitive age, which, as is confessed, abstained from the names of priesthood and temples,—we add that which we have proved, and from *altars*,—have misliked the liberty of succeeding Fathers for alteration of the phrase, they are not herein to be judged adversaries, but rather zealous emulators and favourers of true antiquity."²

But it appears to me, I confess, both difficult to determine any precise period at which the use of the *word* altar to express the communion table arose, for it certainly appears to have been used by Ignatius, and also a matter of indifference. For all that we are concerned with is, whether the name was used properly or improperly.³ And that it was used only metaphorically, seems to me capable of easy proof, from this simple and undeniable fact, that when Celsus and others accused the Christians of not having any altars, they *admitted that they had none*, and justified the fact, as we learn from Origen, Minutius Felix, and Arnobius.⁴

But our opponents will perhaps say, True they denied that they had altars, but then they meant only such altars as received bloody sacrifices, and not such altars as we contend for. Let us observe, then, in what words Origen makes this denial. To the charge of Celsus on this head, Origen replies, "He sees not that *our altars* are THE MIND

¹ De cult. sanct. lib. 3. c. 4.

² Cath. App. ii. 6. § 2. p. 164.

³ "Howbeit," says Bishop Jewell, "the old learned Fathers, as they oftentimes delighted themselves with these words, *Sabbatum, Parasceve, Pascha, Pentecoste*, and such other like terms of the Old Law, notwithstanding the observation and ceremony thereof were then abolished and out of use; even so likewise they delighted themselves oftentimes with these words, *sacerdos, altare, sacrificium, the sacrificer, the altar, the sacrifice*, notwithstanding the use thereof were then *clearly expired*, only for that the ears of the people, as well of the Jews as of the Gentiles, had been long acquainted with the same." Jewell's Reply to Harding, art. 17. Works, p. 410.

⁴ Orig. c. Cels. viii. § 17. Op. ed. Ben. i. p. 755. Min. Felix in Octav. § 32. Arnob. adv. Gent. vi. & vii.

of each of the righteous, from whence are sent up truly and spiritually incense offerings of sweet savour, even the prayers that proceed from a pure conscience.”¹ This passage, then, completely concludes against such an answer as we have supposed, namely, that they denied that they had altars *only* because their sacrifices were not bloody, and therefore their altars only improperly called altars, because then this distinction would have been drawn by Origen; but, on the contrary, he admits the charge fully, and replies that our *hearts* are our *altars*, showing that the true sacrifice in the eucharist was the offering up of Christ upon the altar of the heart, in our prayers and praises. And the same answer is made to Julian upon a similar occasion by Cyril of Alexandria.²

Further, so far from the Fathers believing that such a sacrifice was “the ‘pure offering’ which Malachi foretold that the Gentiles should offer,” we have the clearest evidence that they understood the passage in a different sense, even when they made it refer directly to the eucharist. This may be seen in the passage already quoted above from Justin Martyr,³ where, after referring to this very passage, he describes the sacrifices in these words:—“That therefore both prayers and thanksgivings made by the worthy are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God, I also affirm. For *these alone* Christians have been taught to perform, both for a memorial of their food, both as to meat and drink, and one in which a commemoration is made of the passion which God [the Son] of God suffered for them.” Here, then, it is distinctly stated, with reference to this passage of Malachi, that the only sacrifices offered to God in the eucharist were those of prayer and thanksgiving.

¹ Ουχ ὁρων, ὅτι βαμοὶ μὲν εἰσιν ἡμῖν τοῦ ἑκάστου τῶν δικαίων ἡγεμονικόν, ἀφ’ οὗ ἀναπεμπεται ἀληθῶς καὶ νοητῶς εὐωδὴ θυμιαμάτων, αἱ προσευχαὶ ἀπο συνειδησεως καθαρὰς. Origen *ut supra*.

² Contr. Julian. lib. 10. pp. 343, 345, & 350. Tom. 6. ed. Aubert.

³ See pp. 54, 55 above.

Again, how does Irenæus interpret this passage? He distinctly interprets the pure offering to be not such a sacrifice as our opponents mean, but the oblation of the bread and wine to God as the firstfruits of his gifts. "Giving counsel," he says, "to his disciples to offer to God the *firstfruits of his creatures*, not as if God needed them, but that they might be neither unfruitful nor ungrateful, he took the bread which is of the creature, and gave thanks, saying, 'This is my body;' and in like manner, the cup which is of the creature, which is according to us, he confessed to be his blood; and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the whole world to God, who gives us our food, as the *firstfruits of his gifts* under the New Testament, of which Malachi, in the Twelve Prophets, thus prophesied," quoting Mal. i. 10, 11.¹

And hence we may see the meaning of that passage in Justin Martyr, in which, alluding again to this passage of Malachi, he says,—“But he there utters a prediction concerning the sacrifices offered up to him in every place by us Gentiles, that is, of the bread of the eucharist, and the cup likewise of the eucharist, and says that we glorify his name, and that you profane it.”² Here Justin Martyr appears, like Irenæus, to have regarded the bread and wine as themselves, in a sense, (as undoubtedly they are), a sacrifice to God; while by comparing this with the passage

¹ Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura est panis accepit et gratias egit, dicens, 'Hoc est corpus meum.' Et calcem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, et Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in Novo Testamento, de quo in Duodecim Prophetis Malachias sic præsignificavit, Non est mihi voluntas in vobis, &c. IREN. adv. Hær. iv. 32. p. 323, ed. Grabe.

² Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τοῦ ὕψ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουντεστὶ τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλεγει τότε, εἰπὼν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξαζεῖν ἡμᾶς, ὅμας δὲ βεβηλοῦν. Dial. cum Tryph. § 41. p. 138.

we have just quoted from him, it is no less evident that he esteemed the sacrifice of prayer and praise to be the great and all-important sacrifice in this service.

Further, Tertullian does not even apply the passage at all, i. e. in any express terms, to the eucharist in particular, but to the sacrifices of prayer and praise generally. After quoting this passage in his Treatise against the Jews, and annexing to it Ps. xvi. 7, 8, he adds, "For that we ought to sacrifice to God not with earthly but with spiritual sacrifices, we thus read in Scripture, 'A broken and contrite heart is God's victim,' and elsewhere, 'sacrifice to God *the sacrifice of praise*, and pay thy vows unto the Most High.' In these words, therefore, the spiritual sacrifices of praise are designated, and a broken heart is shown to be an acceptable sacrifice to God. . . . And of *spiritual sacrifices* he adds these words, '*And in every place pure sacrifices shall be offered to my name.*' [Mal. i. 11.]"¹ And so again in another place he speaks still more plainly, where, quoting this passage of Malachi, "In every place a sacrifice shall be offered to my name, even a pure sacrifice," he immediately adds, "*NAMELY, the ascription of glory, and benediction, and praise, and hymns.*"²

¹ Cur itaque postea per Prophetas prædicat Spiritus futurum, ut in omni terra aut in omni loco offerantur sacrificia Deo, sicut per Malachiam angelum unum ex Duodecim Prophetis dicit, 'Non recipiam sacrificium de manibus vestris, quoniam ab oriente sole usque ad occidentem nomen meum clarificatum est in omnibus gentibus, dicit Dominus Omnipotens; et in omni loco offeruntur sacrificia munda nomini meo.' Item in Psalmis David dicit: 'Adferre Deo patriæ gentium',—indubitate quod in omnem terram exire habebat prædicatio Apostolorum,—'Adferre Deo claritatem et honorem, adferre Deo sacrificia nominis ejus; tollite hostias et introite in atria ejus. Namque quod non terrenis sacrificiis sed spiritalibus Deo litandum sit, ita legimus ut scriptum est; Cor contribulatum et humiliatum hostia Deo est. Et alibi; Sacrifica Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua. Sic itaque sacrificia spiritalia laudis designantur, et cor contribulatum acceptabile sacrificium Deo demonstratur . . . De spiritalibus vero sacrificiis addit, dicens, Et in omni loco sacrificia munda offerentur nomini meo, dicit Dominus. Tertull. adv. Jud. pp. 187, 8.

² Ut pariter concurreret et Malachiæ prophetia, 'Non est voluntas mea, dicit Dominus, . . . et in omni loco sacrificium nomini meo offertur et sacrificium mundum,' *gloriæ scilicet relatio, et benedictio et laus et hymni.*" Tert. adv. Marc. iii. 22. p. 410.

And again, "As Malachi says, . . . 'In every place sacrifice shall be offered to my name, even a pure sacrifice,' NAMELY, *sincere prayer from a pure conscience*."¹

Passages from other Fathers² might be quoted of a similar import, but these are, I suppose, amply sufficient.

That the passage includes a reference to the eucharist, as one, and perhaps the most important, of the spiritual sacrifices of the Christian, I have no doubt; and this it is evident the Fathers considered it to do; but the earliest and best of them, at least, did not, as we have seen, refer it to that exclusively, nor give the least countenance, but the contrary, to our opponents' *application* of it. That the passage, therefore, can be taken as proving any such sacrifice, when the Fathers so clearly testify that the spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise fully satisfy the meaning of it, cannot of course be admitted.

I need hardly observe that the argument is, like almost all those of our opponents, an arrow taken from the quiver of the Romanists, and thus is it replied to by their own witness, Bishop Morton. "As little help can they hope for from the second place of Malachie, which the most Fathers expound of *other spiritual sacrifices*, such as is the preaching of the Gospel (Tertull.), sacrifice of prayers from a pure heart (Euseb.); sacrifice of all gifts of devotion offered in christian assemblies (Iren. & Just. Mart.); the sacrifice of all godly actions (Euseb.); and such like. . . But what shall we need to prove our interpretation of this text to be true whereunto their own great doctor, Montanus, hath so fully subscribed?" It "must be expounded, as their own Montanus sheweth, of *spiritual sacrifice*. 1 Pet. ii. 9. Ye are a royal priesthood. Rev. i. 6. Even kings and priests unto God. Ar. Mont. in Mal."³

Still further, we have positive evidence in Scripture

¹ Dicente Malachia, 'Non est voluntas mea in vobis . . . et in omni loco sacrificium nomini meo offertur et sacrificium mundum,' *scilicet simplex oratio de conscientia pura*. Tert. adv. Marc. iv. 1. pp. 413, 414.

² See Hieron. in Zech. c. 8, vv. 7, 8.

Cath. App. ii. 7. § 2. p. 167.

against such a notion. How is it to be reconciled, for instance, with what is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the Apostle, after having spoken of the frequently-recurring sacrifices of the Old Testament, contrasts with them the "one" sacrifice of the New. "This man," he says, "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God . . . For by *one offering* he hath *perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us . . . their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is *no more offering for sin*. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus . . . let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith," &c. (Heb. x. 12 et seq.) Words cannot more clearly show that there is no such sacrifice appointed under the New Testament as the Tractators dream of. For the sacrifice advocated by them is as much a propitiatory sacrifice as were any of those of the Old Testament. For *they* had no value in themselves, but only as they represented the one great sacrifice.

And the true nature of the eucharist is very forcibly shown in a passage of the same Apostle elsewhere: "Christ our passover," he says, "is sacrificed (*εθυθη, has been sacrificed*) for us, therefore let us *keep the feast*." (1 Cor. v. 7, 8.) The sacrifice, then, has been already offered, and it remains for us to keep the feast in thankful remembrance of it, and thanksgiving to God for its benefits.

Further, this sacrifice is not sanctioned by the earliest Fathers.

We have already had occasion to observe the terms in which Irenæus speaks of the sacrifice in the eucharist, and we learn from him that the sacrifice, as far as regarded the elements themselves, was an oblation of them to God before the act of consecration, not as the symbols of Christ's body and blood, but as his creatures of bread and wine, that, having received his blessing, they might

afterwards be partaken of, with a grateful remembrance of God's mercies, *temporal and spiritual*.

And in another place he speaks still more clearly, "It becomes us to make an oblation to God, and to be found in all things grateful to God our Creator, offering to him with a pure mind and faith without hypocrisy, in firm hope, in fervent love, *the firstfruits of his creatures*. This *oblation* the holy Church alone offers to the Creator, offering to him *of his creature* with thanksgiving."¹

This oblation, or sacrifice, then, is altogether different to that for which our opponents contend; and this sacrifice, as Mede observes, is in effect offered "so often as we set the bread and wine upon the holy table; for whatsoever we set upon God's table is *ipso facto* dedicated and offered unto him." Such an oblation or sacrifice, therefore, is virtually made whenever the eucharist is celebrated; though, in our present service, instead of placing the oblation in the mere act of setting the bread and wine upon the table, I should rather consider it to be more especially made where, in the prayer for the Church militant,² we beg of God to receive our "alms and *oblations*," the term "*oblations*" here clearly referring to the bread and wine, which are offered by *the people*, who now *provide* them as of old they used themselves to *bring* them. And such oblation is implied when they are actually dedicated to a sacred use in the prayer of consecration; and when we say,—“Grant that we receiving *THESE thy creatures of bread and wine*, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body

¹ Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere et in omnibus gratos inveniri Fabricatori Deo, in sententia pura et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firma, in dilectione ferventi, primitias earum quæ sunt ejus creaturarum offerentes. Hanc oblationem Ecclesia sola pura offert Fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura ejus. Iren. adv. Hær. iv. 34. p. 326. ed. Grabe.

² It is, I suppose, from this feeling, that the rubric which enjoins that "*the priest shall place upon the table*" the bread and wine, is not usually strictly attended to. Seeing, however, that the rubric so directs, they are not, I think, to be blamed who adhere to it.

and blood,"—we, as it were, direct the attention of our heavenly Father to the elements as placed upon his table, and recognize them as there offered up for his service, to be applied to the sacred purpose of representing the body and blood of Christ. But it is obvious that such an oblation differs *toto cælo* from that for which our opponents contend, which is an oblation of the *consecrated* elements to God *as* symbolically *the body and blood of Christ*, as a *sacrifice like the sacrifices of the Old Testament*, to be offered moreover by *the priest* solely in a strictly sacerdotal character, and *obtaining for the Church remission of sins*.

Still more plainly speaks (as we have seen) Justin Martyr, who, overlooking altogether, in one passage we have quoted, *any material* sacrifice in the eucharist, from its comparative want of value, places the sacrifice wholly in the prayers and thanksgivings offered. "Prayers and thanksgivings made by the worthy," says Justin Martyr, speaking of the sacrifices of the New Testament mentioned by Malachi, "are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God. *These alone Christians have been taught to perform*, both for a memorial of their food both as to meat and drink, and one in which a commemoration is made of the passion which God [the Son] of God offered for them." ¹ The oblation of the elements themselves is here as it were put out of sight as *comparatively* of no moment, and the memorial is made to consist wholly in the "prayers and thanksgivings" offered.

There is also another remarkable passage in his first Apology to the same effect. "Who, therefore, in his senses," he says, "will not confess that we are not atheists, who worship the Maker of this Universe, and say, as we have been taught, that he is in no need of blood and libations, and incense, praising him to the best of our ability for all the blessings we enjoy, *with the words of prayer and thanksgiving*,"² both on account of our creation and all the means of health, and the qualities of his pro-

¹ See pp. 54, 55 above.

² Λογῶ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερομεθα πᾶσι δὴ δυνάμει αἰνοῦν-

ductions, and the changes of seasons, and uttering supplications that we may again enjoy eternal life through faith which is in him ; having been taught that *this honour is alone such as is worthy of him*, namely, not to consume by fire those things that were given by him for food, but to apply them for *our own use and that of those who are in want*, and with hearts grateful to him to send forth *by words* devotions and hymns.”¹

Nothing can well be more explicit and to the point than this passage.

Nor should we overlook the account given by Justin Martyr of the primitive form of the eucharistic service, because, if our opponents' views were correct, we could hardly fail to find there some notice of their supposed sacrifice. But do we find it? These are his words. “There is then brought to him who presides over the brethren [assembled] bread, and a cup of water and wine ; and he having taken them pours forth praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and Holy Spirit, and makes a thanksgiving for our being considered worthy of these things by Him ; and when he has ended the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present assent, saying, Amen. But *Amen* in the Hebrew tongue signifies *so be it*. And the president having given thanks, and all the people assented, those that are called by us, deacons, distribute to each of those present of the bread and wine and water over which thanks have been thus given, to be partaken of by them ; and carry part away

res. The Benedictine translation of ἐφ' οἷς π. π. “*in his omnibus quæ offerimus*” would require προσφερομεν. The word προσφερομεθα is, I conceive, of the middle voice.

¹ Μοινην αξιαν αυτου τιμην ταυτην παραλαβοντες, το τα ὑπ' εκεινου εις διατροφην γενομενα ου πυρι δαπαναν, αλλ' ἑαυτοις και τοις δεομενοις προσφερειν, εκεινω δε ευχαριστους οντας δια λογου πομπας και ὕμνους πεμπειν. Apol. 1. § 13. pp. 50, 51. The word πομπας (if it be really the true reading) has, I suppose, a reference to the ceremonies of the heathen in honour of their gods, but the words δια λογου clearly show to what sort of Christian acts of religious devotion it refers.

to those that were not present.”¹ And further on he repeats the account in words of precisely the same import.²

I ask with confidence, Is this account *reconcilable* with the notions of our opponents? Is there here any such sacrifice, or altar, or priest, as they dream of? No; here we have in its original simplicity the sacred rite instituted by our Lord, and delivered to us in the Scriptures of the Apostles.

Lastly, Tertullian, as we have seen, invariably describes the sacrifice of the New Testament mentioned by Malachi, as a “spiritual” sacrifice, “the sacrifice of praise,” “the ascription of glory, and benediction, and praise, and hymns,” “sincere prayer from a pure conscience.”³

Now, without at all denying that at a subsequent period there might be an oblation of the elements *after* consecration, and that this might be considered more peculiarly the *external* sacrificial part of the eucharist, I argue thus: Is it possible to reconcile the language of Irenæus and Justin Martyr with the supposition that it was so in their time, or at least in their part of the Church, which is enough for our purpose? I submit with confidence that it is not. I say not merely that our opponents’ notion of the *nature and effects* of this sacrifice is opposed by their testimony, because *that* is opposed by all pure antiquity, but also that these testimonies are distinctly opposed to the notion that there was at that time any such oblation or sacrifice as a *second* offering up of the elements, taking

¹ Επειτα προσφερεται τω προεστωτι των αδελφων αρτος, και ποτηριον υδατος και κραματος [afterwards called οινου]. Και οδτος λαβων, αινον και δοξαν τω Πατρι των ολων δια του ονοματος του 'Τιου και του Πνευματος του αγιου αναπεμπει' και ευχαριστιαν υπερ του κατηξιωσθαι τουτων παρ' αυτου επι πολυ ποιειται. ου συντελεσαντος τας ευχας και την ευχαριστιαν, πας ο παρων λαος επευφημει λεγων, αμην. Το δε αμην, τη Εβραιδι φωνη, το γενοιτο σημαινει. Ευχαριστησαντος δε του προεστωτος, και επευφημισαντος παντος του λαου, οι καλουμενοι παρ' ημιν διακονοι διδουσιν εκαστω των παροντων μεταλαβειν απο του ευχαριστηθεντος αρτου και οινου και υδατος, και τοις ου παρουσιν αποφερουσι. Apol. l. § 65. pp. 82, 3. ed. Bened.

² Ib. § 67. p. 83.

³ See pp. 157, 158 above.

place *after* their consecration. For had it been so, this would have been more especially and peculiarly that part of the office which had the sacrificial character, as our opponents (justly according to their view) represent it to be, whereas Irenæus expressly represents the sacrificial part of it, *as far as concerns any sacrifice of the elements themselves*, to consist in the oblation of the bread and wine *as the firstfruits of God's creatures*, in order that they *may* be applied to the purposes of the eucharist, and speaks of *this* as the sacrifice of the New Testament referred to by Malachi; while Justin Martyr and Tertullian overlooking generally any *material* sacrifice in the eucharist, place the sacrifice wholly in the prayers and thanksgivings that are offered up, even that offering up of the true sacrifice of the cross to God upon the altar of the heart, which is presented by every faithful worshipper when receiving the outward memorials of that sacrifice.

The breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine that take place in the communion are a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross, and this act of commemoration, in which every communicant partakes, when accompanied with faithful thanksgivings for the sacrifice it represents, is an acceptable sacrifice to God. We deny not, therefore, be it observed, that there is a sacrifice offered to God in this part of the service, but it is a sacrifice of *personal service, not of the elements*, and performed by every communicant, and although that personal service consists partly in outward actions, its far more important and essential part is in the feelings of the heart towards God.

A better statement of the whole question can hardly perhaps be found than is given by our opponents' own witness Bishop White. "Touching the name and title of sacrifice, our Church giveth the same to the holy eucharist; and that not only in respect of certain pious actions annexed unto it, to wit, prayer, thanksgiving, alms, &c.—Rom. xii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 5.—but in regard of the eucharist itself; wherein first the outward elements

of bread and wine receiving the calling of God (Iren. l. 4. c. 34.) are made sacred and appointed to divine worship, 1 Cor. xi. 26, and become instruments of grace to men. Secondly, the body and blood of Christ, PRESENT TO THE SOUL, are, by THE FAITH AND DEVOTION *of the pastor and people which receive these mysteries*, presented and tendered to God, with request that he will vouchsafe for the merit thereof to bestow grace and remission of sins, and other benefits upon them.”¹

That any argument should be derived by our opponents from the word *sacrifice* being used with reference to the eucharist is on the face of it absurd, because the word is constantly used by the Fathers in a sense *wholly spiritual*, and signifying *only* prayers or offerings of the heart. This we have already seen in several instances, which are the more pertinent to our present subject, as having an especial reference to the eucharist, but of general instances it would be easy to add many more. “We *sacrifice*,” says Tertullian, “for the safety of the Emperor, but to our God and his, and in the manner in which God hath directed, namely, with *pure prayers*.”² “A good spirit, a pure mind, a sincere conscience . . . these,” says Minucius Felix, “are *our sacrifices*, these are God’s sacred offerings.”³ And so indeed is the word frequently used by the Apostles in the New Testament.⁴

And Bishop Morton has shown that this word is also used with respect to *baptism*, adding, “Wherefore by this analogy between these two sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, we may conclude out of the testimony of St. Augustine, recorded by their antient schoolman Aquinas,

¹ F. White’s *Orthodox Faith and Way to the true Church explained*. With Works of John White, p. 158.

² *Sacrificamus pro salute Imperatoris, sed Deo nostro et ipsius, sed quomodo præcepit Deus, pura prece.* Ad. Scap. c. 2. p. 69. See also his *Apologet.* c. 30.

³ *Bonus animus et pura mens et sincera conscientia . . . hæc nostra sacrificia, hæc Dei sacra sunt.* Min. Fel. *De idol. vanit.* ed. Oxon. 1678. p. 95.

⁴ See Rom. xii. 1. Phil. iv. 18. Heb. xiii. 15, 16. 1 Pet. ii. 5.

‘that *signs* are called by the names of those things which they do represent, as for example, of the *painted image* of Cicero we use to say, this is Cicero. And so the celebration of this sacrament which is a representation of Christ’s passion, the true immolation or sacrificing, is called an immolation.”¹

The application, therefore, of this word *sacrifice* to the eucharist by the Fathers proves nothing in favour of our opponents.

If, then, the testimony of Scripture, and of the earliest Fathers, is opposed to the notion of such a sacrifice as our opponents contend for in the eucharist, the other three propositions are answered in this.

But we must not pass them over without notice, for in them lies the poison of the whole doctrine. That there should be such a sacrifice made in the eucharist, is a matter which, though far from unimportant, is *comparatively* of little moment. That such a doctrine as that of our opponents should be held respecting it, is a matter of vast moment, embracing as it does some of the worst errors of the Romish system.

It is maintained, then, *secondly*, that the minister performs this act in a strictly sacerdotal character.

This notion has been already completely overthrown by the testimonies of Tertullian and Justin Martyr, adduced in a former page, to which I refer the reader.² In these passages Tertullian and Justin Martyr assert, *with particular respect to the sacrifice of the eucharist*, that ALL Christians are priests to God. It thence clearly follows, that in the eucharist the minister is but the guide and leader of the devotions of the people. It is worthy of observation, that the word used to describe the Levitical priests, (*ιερευς*), is never used in the New Testament for the ministers of Christ, but wherever it is used it is ap-

¹ Cath. App. ii. 7. § 8. pp. 173, 4, and see his Treatise of the Lord’s Supper, ed. 1652.

² See pp. 52, 54, above.

plied generally to the whole body of believers.¹ Nor is the term so applied by the Apostolical Fathers or Justin Martyr. One passage only occurs in their genuine remains that has ever been thought of as an instance, namely, in Ignatius,² where Pearson, Smith, and Markland understand it of Levitical priests, and in Jacobson's view rightly.

I know not, indeed, how any man can read the Epistle to the Hebrews, and persevere in maintaining such a notion as that which we are here opposing.

The Apostle in that Epistle seems with studied assiduity to impress upon our minds the fact, that with us there is but one sacrifice and one priest, a sacrifice all prevalent for the full remission of sins, and a priest who, being eternal, for ever liveth to present it, and make intercession for us; and that, consequently, *every true Christian* has, *at all times*, a sacrifice and a priest to present it for him to God, *without the intervention of any other person or thing whatever*.³ And the service of the eucharist differs only (*as far as the act of worship in it is concerned*) from the private services of the Christian in his closet, from its being accompanied by certain external acts, indicative and expressive of our thankful remembrance of and faith in the sacrifice of the cross, in which the minister does nothing but as the hand and voice of the whole assembly, as all pure antiquity bears witness.

And further, we may remark, that St. Paul, when speaking of the ministers of the Old and New Testament, describes the former as "they which wait at the altar," and the latter as "they which preach the gospel,"⁴ a distinction very different to what he would have drawn had he held the views of the Tractators.

And so far is Hooker, whom our opponents have quoted as a maintainer of their views, from supporting

¹ Rev. i. 6; v. 10; and see 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9.

² Καλοὶ καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς. Ad Philad. § 9.

³ See particularly Heb. vii. 23—28. viii. 1, 6. x. 19—22.

⁴ 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.

them in this, that he distinctly says, (as already quoted,) "In truth the word *presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable, than *priest*, with the drift of the whole gospel of Jesus Christ,"¹ which he never would have said had he held our opponents' views, but merely drawn the *distinction* which they draw between the Levitical priest and the Christian priest, as the one offering bloody and the other unbloody sacrifices, and not have *given up* the appellation altogether, and *substituted presbyter* for it.

Not, indeed, as I have already intimated, that the use of such a *word* is a matter of any great moment, because we hold, with Hooker, that there is no reason why "the very name of altar, of priest, of sacrifice itself, should be banished out of the world." "For," adds that judicious writer, "though God do now hate sacrifice, whether it be heathenish or Jewish, so that we cannot have the same things which they had but with impiety; yet unless there be some greater let than the only evacuation of the Law of Moses, the *names themselves* may (I hope) be retained without sin, in respect of that *proportion* which things established by our Saviour have unto them which by him are abrogated; and so throughout all the writings of the antient Fathers we see that the words which were do continue; the only difference is, that whereas before they had a literal they now have a metaphorical use, and are as so many notes of remembrance unto us, that what they did signify in the letter is accomplished in the truth."²

And we say with Archbishop Whitgift,—“I am not greatly delighted with the name, [i. e. *priest*,] nor so desirous to maintain it; but yet a truth is to be defended. I read in the old Fathers, that these two names, *Sacerdos* and *Presbyter*, be confounded. I see, also, that the learned and the best of our English writers, such, I mean, as write in these our days, translate the word *Presbyter*

¹ See pp. 141, 2, above.

² Eccl. Pol. bk. iv. c. 11.

so; and the very word itself, as it is used in our English tongue, soundeth the word *Presbyter*. As heretofore use hath made it to be taken for a *sacrificer*, so will use now alter that signification, and make it to be taken for a *minister of the gospel*. But it is mere vanity to contend for the name when we *agree of the thing*.”¹ So that with respect to “*the thing*,” the Archbishop agreed with his opponent, Cartwright. And in another place he says,—“I suppose it [the word *priest*] cometh of this word *presbyter*, not of *sacerdos*, and then the matter is not great.”² The word *priest*, therefore, has been freely used by our divines, not merely as the English for *presbyter*, but in the same sense as *ιερευσ* and *sacerdos* got into use among the Fathers, namely, as significative of that office under the New Testament, that *corresponds* (as far as the genius of the two Dispensations admits) to that which the priests held under the Old, just as the words *altar* and *sacrifice* may be used to denote those things which have a sort of correspondence with those that were so called under the Old Testament.³

I will only add here, on this head, a passage of Cyprian, where the phraseology seems to me clearly to show that the people were considered as much *sacrificers* as the priest. “When,” says Cyprian, “we come together with the brethren and *celebrate the divine sacrifices* WITH *God’s priest*, we ought to be mindful of modesty and discipline.”⁴ Would this language have been used, if the sacrifice was offered only by the priest? Would it have been used under the Old Testament? Moreover, I shall show, under the next head, that even at a subsequent period, when the custom of the post-consecration sacrifice

¹ Whitgift’s Def. of Answ. to Admon. p. 722.

² Answ. to Adm. in Def. of Answ. p. 721. See, also, Davenant. Determ. q. 13. p. 62. ed. 1^a.

³ See Bishop Mant’s Expos. of the Ordination services, in his Notes on the Common Prayer.

⁴ Quando in unum cum fratribus convenimus, et *sacrificia divina cum Dei sacerdote celebramus*, verecundiæ et disciplinæ memores esse debemus. Cypr. De orat. Dom. prope init. ed. Col. 1617. p. 156.

appears to have prevailed, still the people were considered as much the sacrificers as the priest.

It is maintained, thirdly, that by this sacrifice, so offered by a priest, remission of sins is obtained for the whole Church.¹

So that faithful laymen have nothing to do but to pay a priest for offering the sacrifice, or, as the Romanists would speak, for saying mass, and they have remission of sins. That their hearts should, by prayer and thanksgiving, offer up in that eucharist the true sacrifice of the cross to God for their pardon, is no instrument in the impetration of that pardon. No; the priest is the mediator and intercessor between God and the people; and by *his* act in sacrificing, and not through any act of theirs, remission of sins is obtained for them. And thus the Christian minister set apart for the sake of the good order and well-being of the Church, to lead the devotions of

¹ If any of my readers have any doubt as to the correctness of the representation I have here given of the doctrine of our opponents, I would advise them to refer to a little treatise lately re-published at Oxford, written by "J. Scandret, *Priest of the Church of England*," entitled, "*Sacrifice the divine service*;" in which the author tells us that "the true and proper sense" of "the word *sacrifice*," is "to signify and express among us the oblation of the Christian Church, which the priest makes at the altar, as the great work of his high office and place, *to render God propitious to man*." (p. 43.) "So vain are some in their expressions of this kind, as to ascribe to prayer our communion with God, which one would think that every Christian should know to be had *only* by our partaking of the great Christian oblation." (pp. 50, 51.) "Does the Christian priest," he asks, as of an absurd notion, "at the Christian altar offer the great oblation, as *personating the Christian congregation*?" (p. 57.) "The sacrifice of the priesthood is prevalent, above all things in this world, to render God propitious to them." (p. 63.) "They [the Bishops and priests] unite God to us, and us to God, by appearing between both with the sacrifice of peace." (p. 64.) "The pardon of sin is the work of God, and of Jesus Christ as our Priest and Sacrifice in the truth; and of his substitute priests under him, by making the appointed demand thereof, even by bringing into God's presence the prevailing sacrifices of his Son in the commanded representations thereof." (pp. 126, 7.) "The offerings and remission of sin, which earthly priests do make and procure to us . . . As it [i. e. remission of sins] was to be had under the Law, by the Law sacrifices, so under the Gospel, by the new oblation of the New Testament." (p. 194.) "The great Christian sacrifice does take away sin, as the Jewish sacrifices did under the Law." (p. 199.)

the people, and preside over their assemblies for public worship, and exhort them to their spiritual duties, is turned into a sacrificing priest, making an atonement for the sins of the people; and the offering up of the consecrated elements by him to God, is a true propitiatory sacrifice, by which, instrumentally, remission of sins is obtained for the Church. The Tractator has not even qualified his statements by the limitation which Harding himself admitted, in his controversy with Jewel, namely, by the words "where there is no stop nor let to the contrary, on the behalf of the receiver."⁶ I will give him, however, the full credit of meaning what he says to be understood with such a limitation; and we will suppose, further, that it is not the mere sacrificing act performed by the priest, but the act, as accompanied by intercessory prayer; (though I suspect that in this I am granting our opponents more than they would ask for;) and what does it amount to? That the faithful obtain remission of their sins, mediately and instrumentally, through the sacrifice performed by the priest, aye, even *ex opere operato*. And hence it is that this part of the service is performed by some of those who have embraced these views in the true Romish style; that is, as if the people bore no part in it.

Now, in this doctrine is contained the very essence of the Romish corruption of the true faith on this point. For it is here broadly maintained that remission of sins is obtained for men, by a priest celebrating the eucharist; nay, as we shall see presently, that the dead, whose sins committed after baptism, we are told elsewhere, remain uncanceled till the day of judgment, and may, till then, be visited upon them in the intermediate state, may, by a priest celebrating the eucharist, obtain an increase of joy and refreshment; amounting, in fact, to a remission of the punishment of sin. The consequence is, that the eucharist becomes a true propitiatory sacrifice, available even for those who do not partake of it; and men obtain remission of sins, not through their own faith and repent-

⁶ Jewel's Answ. to Harding, Art. 20. Works, p. 437.

ance, and prayers, and conformity to the ordinances of Christ, but through the sacrifice commemorative of Christ's sacrifice, made by a priest in the eucharist.

If this is the case, then are the private masses of the Church of Rome both useful and laudable ; while, nevertheless, I beg to ask, with Bishop Jewel, where we can find "any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may clearly and plainly be proved that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ?"¹ And we further ask, with him, where we can find any such testimony for the proposition, "that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely, and in silence to himself;"² which, though our opponents do not, perhaps, actually do, because they might, in the Church of England, be called to account for it, yet *might be done upon their principles*,³ (I leave others to ascertain whether it is not *actually* done sometimes, by the adoption of a *manner* which has *the same effect*,) or "that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that mass, *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin."⁴

For a full reply to these three propositions, and overwhelming evidence against them, both from Scripture and Fathers, I refer the reader to Bishop Jewel's invaluable "Reply to Harding."⁵

Of these three propositions, we say with him ;—Of the first, that in rejecting it, "we rest upon the Scriptures of God, upon the authority of the ancient doctors and Coun-

¹ Reply to Harding, Art. 1. Works, p. 1.

² Reply to Harding, Art. 16. Works, p. 402.

³ As Thomas Aquinas says, "The oblation and consecration belong only to the priest [which is the view of our opponents] and *therefore* the words be spoken in silence, as nothing pertaining to the people." P. 3. q. 183, as cited by Jewel, in reply to Harding, Art. 16. p. 407.

⁴ Reply to Harding. Art. 20. Works, p. 437.

⁵ See Art. 1, 16 and 20.

cils, and upon the universal practice of the most famous cities and Churches of the world ;”¹ of the second, that it “hath been only received in the Church of Rome, and no where else, and that only for a time, and not from the beginning ; and therefore mere particular, and no way universal, and so not Catholic ;” that it is “utterly void of any show, either of the Scriptures, or of the old Councils, or antient Fathers, or of any manner antiquity ;” and is “against S. Ambrose, against S. Augustine, against S. Chrysostom, against Leo, against his own Clemens, against the whole primitive Church, both Greek and Latin, and against the decrees and traditions of the Apostles ;”² and of the third, that “to ascribe felicity or remission of sin, which is the inward work of the Holy Ghost, unto ANY MANNER OUTWARD ACTION WHATSOEVER, is a superstitious, a gross, and a Jewish error.”³

Now, it is very possible that our opponents, *like Harding himself*, will strenuously deny that this last proposition exhibits their view. When their view is made to stand forth in its naked deformity, they will, *like Harding*, beg the reader to turn away his eyes from it, until they have clothed it in garments which shall *conceal* its real shape ; and, in the art of thus clothing their doctrines, it must be admitted that they are adepts. “It is Christ only,” saith Harding, indignantly, “and none other thing, that is able to remove our sins ; and that hath he done, by the sacrifice of his body once done upon the cross.” What can be more orthodox ? Again, “Christ, in his flesh crucified, is our only sacrifice, our only price, our only redemption, whereby he hath merited to us upon the cross, and with the price of his blood hath bought the remission of our sins ; and St. John saith, ‘he is the propitiation for our sins.’ . . . And this, not for that it is offered of the priest in the mass *specially* ; but for that he offered it once himself, with shedding of his blood upon the cross, for the redemption of all. Which oblation, done upon

¹ Reply, Art. 1. p. 71.

² Reply to Harding, Art. 16. p. 409.

³ Ib. Art. 20. p. 442.

the cross, is become a perpetual and continual oblation ; not in the same manner of offering, but in the same virtue and power of the thing offered. For, since that time, the same body of Christ appearing always before the face of God in heaven, presenteth and exhibiteth itself for our reconciliation ; and likewise it is exhibited and offered by his own commandment, here in earth, in the mass, where he is both priest and sacrifice, offerer and oblation, verily and indeed, though in mystery, and by way of commemoration, that thereby we may be made partakers of the reconciliation performed, *applying the same unto us*, (so far as in this behalf *man may apply*) through faith and devotion, no less than if we saw with our eyes presently his body hanging on the cross before us, and streams of blood issuing forth. And so it is *a sacrifice in very deed propitiatory, not for our act or work, but for his own work already done and accepted*. To this only we must ascribe remission and removing of our sins." "If the term mass be taken for the act of the priest, *in respect of any his only doing, it is not able to remove sin*. For so we should make the priest God's peer, and his act equal with the passion of Christ, as our adversaries do unjustly slander us. Yet hath the mass *virtue and effect in some degree ; and is acceptable to God, by reason of the oblation of the sacrifice*, which, in the mass, is done by the offerer, without respect had to Christ's institution, even for the faithful prayer and devotion of the party that offereth, which the School-doctors term *ex opere operantis*. For then the oblation seemeth to be most acceptable to God, when it is offered by some that is acceptable. Now the party that offereth is of two sorts. The one offereth immediately and personally ; the other offereth mediately, or by mean of another and principally. The first is the priest that consecrateth, offereth, and receiveth the sacrament, who so doth these things in his own person, yet by God's authority, as none other in so offering is concurrent with him. The party that offereth mediately or by mean of another and principally, is the Church militant, in whose person

the priest offereth, and whose minister he is in offering. For this is *the sacrifice of the whole Church*. The first party that offereth, is not always acceptable to God, neither always pleaseth him; because oftentimes he is a sinner. The second party that offereth, is evermore acceptable to God, because the Church is always holy, beloved, and the only spouse of Christ. And in this respect, the mass is an acceptable service to God, *ex opere operantis*,—and is not without cause and reason called a sacrifice propitiatory; *not for that it deserveth mercy at God's hand, of itself, as Christ doth, who only is, in that principal and special sort, a sacrifice propitiatory; but for that it moveth God to give mercy and remission of sin, already deserved by Christ*. In this degree of a sacrifice propitiatory, we may put prayer, a contrite heart, alms, forgiving of our neighbour, &c.”¹

Now the only difference in this explanation, and that which our opponents could offer, is this, that Harding held the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrifice, while our opponents only admit a sacramental presence in it, (as, indeed, they confess that this is their only difference with the Romanists,) *but the effect ascribed to the performance of the sacrifice by the priest is the same*. Now of this effect only Jewel is here speaking; and of this effect so ascribed to it he says, that it is “a superstitious, a gross, and a Jewish error.” His was not a mind to be deceived by all these fine words of Harding. He looked to the latent tenet which was concealed under all these plausible and delusive phrases.

It was held by the Romish Church, and it is held by our opponents, that by the sacrificial act of the priest in the eucharist, remission of sins is obtained (whether mediately, or indirectly, or in whatever particular way they choose to say, I stay not to inquire) for the whole Church; and such a notion was, in Jewel's estimation, “a superstitious, a gross, and a Jewish error.”

But it will be said, Do you then deny that the service of the eucharist is, in any sense, propitiatory on behalf of

¹ See Jewel's Reply to Hard. Art. 20. Works, pp. 437—440.

the Church? To such a question I must reply more at length than by a direct affirmative or negative, for neither would convey any precise meaning. I deny altogether that the mere offering up of the consecrated elements as a sacrifice to God is a propitiation for the sins of the Church, (which is what our opponents maintain.) I deny, also, that the mere celebration of the eucharist is *necessarily* thus propitiatory, because it might be celebrated without any intercessory prayers for the whole Church, and still be valid to the communicants. Its propitiatory nature depends upon the prayers offered in it. And I am far from denying that the intercessory prayers offered upon such an occasion may have a propitiatory effect with God in behalf of those for whom they are offered. But it is very far from being a consequence of this that the celebration of the eucharist with intercessory prayers for the Church, and the remission of sins to the Church, are like *cause* (call it *mediate*, or *instrumental*, or what you will, but still *cause*) and *effect*, so that where one takes place the other follows as a necessary effect. The propitiatory effect to be expected in this case is of the same kind as that which may be expected from intercessory prayer generally. And hence to attach remission of sins for the Church as a necessary effect and consequent upon the celebration of the eucharist, (even though we substitute for the notion of the priest's sacerdotal prayers the prayers of the whole body of communicants,) is most unwarrantable, and directly leading men to a neglect of this sacred ordinance in their own persons, when they suppose that remission of sins is obtained for them by the acts or prayers of others. This is necessarily, and is proved by experience to be, the practical effect.

But for the exaltation of the priest this no doubt is a most important doctrine. And in the Church of Rome no other doctrine has been so useful for filling the coffers of the Church; and I fear that it would be far from uncharitable to suspect, with Bishop Morton, that the earnestness of their cry in favour of this their great Diana, is not a little attributable to the "no small gain"

unto the craftsmen, especially when we find them maintaining that it is “not so available for *many* as if it be applied to *one alone*,” (a crafty expedient for an almost infinite multiplication of them,) and that “when the priest taketh a stipend of *Peter*, with a condition that he shall, by his intention, apply the mass unto *him* for the good of his soul; and yet peradventure shall not intend it unto *Peter’s* soul, but unto *Paul’s*, or to *his own*; yet, notwithstanding his compact with Peter, the blessing of this sacrifice shall be extended according to *the priest’s intention*.” “This,” says Bishop Morton, “might be thought to be no small happiness of their priesthood, (if yet in a perfidiousness or simony there could be any happiness,) wherein, by virtue of their sacrifice, the priest, even in doing an injury, is notwithstanding made capable of a double benefit, as namely, a *stipend from man*, and a *blessing from God*.”¹

This doctrine respecting the priest’s intention, I take it for granted that our opponents repudiate; and I will only add my regret that they should make such old friends as these two doctrines part company, and not rather have let them travel on together till they both met their just reward.

But to return. In what way, then, it may be asked, are the benefits of this service to be obtained by individuals? We reply, Simply and solely by their own act, when, coming to this holy service in faith and repentance, they receive the bread and wine as the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, in thankful remembrance of his death; and, in the sacrifices of prayer and praise, offer up spiritually upon the altar of their hearts the true body and blood of Christ, the true sacrifice of the cross, as an atonement for their sins, and the foundation of all their hopes.

And here lies the great and most important point of distinction between our views and those of the Tractators.

¹ Cath. App. ii. 7. § 15. pp. 185, 6.

They hold that it is by the sacrificial offering up of the consecrated bread and wine to God, in the office of the eucharist, that the priest obtains instrumentally remission of sins for the communicants and the whole Church. We hold that it is the personal service of each individual in the whole action of the eucharist, when, receiving the bread and wine as the memorials of Christ's passion, he offers up spiritually, in his prayers and thanksgivings, the true sacrifice of the cross to the Father, that obtains for that individual the blessings promised in the eucharist.

In the very same part of Bishop Jewel's works, from which our opponents have taken one of their extracts, that learned prelate thus speaks, clearly showing in what alone he considered the sacrifice in the eucharist to consist;—"The holy learned Fathers apply that word [i. e. unbloody] sometime to prayer and other devotion of the mind, and sometime to the ministration of the holy communion In respect of these gross and fleshly and bloody sacrifices [i. e. of the Old Testament] our Christian sacrifices in the gospel, because they are *mere spiritual, and proceed wholly from the heart*, are called unbloody . . . In like manner the ministration of the holy communion is sometimes of the ancient Fathers called an *unbloody sacrifice, not in respect of any corporal or fleshly presence that is imagined to be there WITHOUT BLOOD-SHEDDING, but for that it representeth UNTO OUR MINDS that one and everlasting sacrifice that Christ made in his body upon the cross This remembrance and oblation of praises, and rendering of thanks unto God for our redemption in the blood of Christ, is called of the old Fathers an unbloody sacrifice . . . This kind of sacrifice, because it is mere spiritual, and groweth only from the mind, therefore it needeth not any material altar of stone or timber to be made upon . . . St. Augustine saith, 'Sacrificium Novi Testamenti est, quando altaria cordis nostri munda et pura in conspectu Divinæ Majestatis offerimus.'* 'The sacrifice of the New Testament is when we offer up the

altars of our hearts pure and clean in the sight of the Divine Majesty.' In these respects our prayers, our praises, our thanksgiving unto God for our salvation in the death of Christ, is called an unbloody sacrifice."¹

The people, then, are as much sacrificers as the priest, and should be taught to expect remission of sins, not from his sacrificing for them, but from their own sacrifice. Though the priest's may be the hand and voice more particularly engaged, the sacrifice must be made as much by them mentally, or they can expect no remission of sins through it. "It is," says Bishop Jewel, "no more the sacrifice of the priest than the sacrifice of any other of all the people."² And "it is not the priest but God only it is that applieth unto each man the remission of his sins in the blood of Christ; not by means of the mass, but *only by the mean of faith*."³

To the same effect (as we have already seen)⁴ speaks Perkins as quoted by Mede.

And so still more plainly speaks another of our opponents' witnesses, and in their own extract, namely, Bishop Bilson,—“Christ is offered daily but mystically, not covered with qualities and quantities of bread and wine, for those be neither mysteries nor resemblances to the death of Christ, but by the bread which is broken, by the wine which is drunk; in substance, creatures; in signification, sacraments; the Lord's death is figured and *proposed to the communicants, and they, for their parts, NO LESS PEOPLE THAN PRIESTS, do present Christ hanging on the cross to God the Father, with a lively faith, inward devotion, and humble prayer, as a most sufficient and everlasting sacrifice for the full remission of their sins, and assured fruition of his mercies.* OTHER ACTUAL AND PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE THAN THIS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST NEVER HAD, NEVER TAUGHT.”⁵ And again; “Neither they

¹ Reply to Harding, Art. 17. Works, pp. 427, 8.

² Reply to Harding, Art. 18. Works, p. 433.

³ Ib. Art. 19, p. 436. ⁴ See p. 147 above.

⁵ See extract given in Catena, in Tract 81, l. 67, or BILSON, Of subjection and rebellion, l. 693.

nor I ever denied the eucharist to be a sacrifice. The very name enforceth it to be the sacrifice of *praise and thanksgiving*, which is *the* true and lively sacrifice of the New Testament. *The Lord's table, in respect of his graces and mercies there proposed to us, is an heavenly banquet, which we must EAT AND NOT SACRIFICE; but the duties which he requireth at our hands, when we approach his table, are sacrifices not sacraments; as namely, to offer him thanks and praises, faith and obedience, yea, our bodies and souls to be living holy and acceptable sacrifices unto him, which is our reasonable service.*"¹ The former part of this extract is given in the Catena. The latter, beginning "The Lord's table, &c.," is not noticed.

Excepting, then, the value which may be attached to intercessory prayer, we maintain that the benefit accruing from the celebration of the eucharistic ordinance, is confined to those who faithfully partake of it. I say, excepting the value which may be attached to intercessory prayer, because we have reason to hope that the prayers offered by *the faithful* in that ordinance for the whole Church are acceptable to God. God has promised to hear our intercessions for others, and when in the eucharist we pray that spiritual blessings may be given to the whole Church for the sake of that sacrifice we are then commemorating, we may humbly hope that God will hear us, and in his own time and way answer our prayers.

I have already endeavoured to show, under a former head, that for the first two centuries, at least, the testimony of the Fathers is opposed to the practice of offering up the elements at all *after* consecration; and therefore, though I admit that this practice may have prevailed at a subsequent period, it is unnecessary to add anything further to show that even patristical tradition fails our opponents in this matter. But the *main* point is not the mere question whether or not this practice prevailed, but with what doctrine it was associated; and I therefore

¹ BILSON, Of subjection and rebellion, p. 699.

think it important here to add, that in the case even of those Fathers of the earlier Church, who speak of the offering up of the elements after consecration as sacramentally the body and blood of Christ, this *external* offering up was not intended by them to usurp the place of, or at all interfere with, the *internal* offering up of the sacrifice of the cross in the *hearts* of the worshippers, as forming *the very essence of the sacrifice*, and without which the other was worthless. And as the external offering was performed by the officiating minister, only as the hand and voice of the worshippers, so the latter was performed, and could only be performed, by the worshippers themselves, and alone rendered them acceptable worshippers, and gave any value to the service, as far as they were concerned, exclusive that is of that *indefinite* and *general* value which a service including intercessory prayer for the whole body of the faithful might be supposed to have.

As Irenæus, *speaking on this very subject*, i. e. with reference to the eucharist, says, "If any one shall have attempted to offer purely, and rightly, and lawfully, as far as respects outward appearance only, but in his heart is not at peace with his neighbour, nor has the fear of God, he does not deceive God by that sacrifice which is rightly offered as to externals, while he has sin in his heart, nor will such an oblation profit him anything."¹ . . . "Sacrifices do not sanctify a man, for God needs not sacrifice; but *the conscience of him who offers*, when pure, sanctifies the sacrifice."²

No words can more clearly show that the offering or

¹ Si enim quis, solummodo secundum quod videtur, munde, et recte, et legitime offerre tentaverit, secundum autem suam animam non recte dividat eam quæ est ad proximum communionem, neque timorem habeat Dei, non per id quod recte foris oblatum est sacrificium seducit Deum, intus habens peccatum, nec oblatio talis proderit ei aliquid. Iren. adv. hæc. iv. 34. p. 325. ed. Grab.

² Non sacrificia sanctificant hominem, non enim indiget sacrificio Deus; sed conscientia ejus qui offert sanctificat sacrificium pura existens. Ib. p. 326, ed. Grabe.

sacrifice is one which must be made by each individual, and that its acceptability depends upon the state of mind of the offerer. And the puerile and evasive mode of explaining away this passage, by saying that the offering in the eucharist is always pure, because it is presented by the holy Catholic Church through the hands of the priest, is unworthy of any candid mind. In fact, it makes the observation of Irenæus useless and absurd, when applied, as he applies it, to the eucharist. And when Irenæus says afterwards that therefore the offering (*munus*) of the Church is an acceptable sacrifice, he is speaking (as the context shows) of the Christian Church, in opposition to the Jews, and contrasting the spiritual sacrifice offered in the former to the material sacrifice offered by the latter.

But let us proceed to the Fathers of a somewhat later period, even when the elements may have been offered after consecration as a sacrifice to God. The doctrine maintained by these was in all essential points the same. I will endeavour to show this, by proving that notwithstanding any importance they may have attached to the post-consecration sacrifice of the elements, they evidently held, (1) That the sacrifice in the eucharist was the offering of all that were present alike, and of those only. (2) That the chief part of the sacrifice was that mental sacrifice of prayer and praise, which it is impossible for one man to offer for another. And hence, (3) That the people are as much the sacrificers as the priest, with the mere exception of the external act of ministration. (4) That the *direct* benefit to be derived from the celebration of the eucharist was to be expected only by the faithful communicants.

To enter fully upon these points would occupy more space than can be spared here for the purpose, but I will give one or two extracts in proof of each.

(1) The sacrifice of the eucharist was considered to be the offering of all that were present alike, and of those only.

Thus Ambrose, or as the Benedictines would say,

Pseud-Ambrose, writing on 1 Cor. xi. 33,4, says, "The Apostle says that we are to wait one for another, that the offering of many may be celebrated at the same time;"¹ where it is evident that the offering was regarded as the offering of those only who were present. And hence it was ordered by the Council of Eliberis, that no oblations should be received but from those who were about to communicate.²

(2). The chief part of the sacrifice was considered to be that mental sacrifice of prayer and praise which it is impossible for one man to offer for another.

"Behold," says Chrysostom, "we have our victim above, our priest above, our sacrifice above. Therefore let us offer such sacrifices as can be presented upon that altar, no longer sheep and oxen, no longer blood and incense; all these things are abolished, and there is introduced in the place of these *rational worship*. But what is rational worship? *That which is offered by the soul; that which is offered by the spirit.*"³ Surely nothing can be plainer than this.

Thus also Eusebius, after having said that Christ "directed us to offer continually to God a remembrance instead of a sacrifice,"⁴ and that this remembrance of Christ's sacrifice was to be celebrated at the table through symbols,⁵ immediately proceeds to remark that "the prophetic oracles proclaim these *immaterial* and *mental*

¹ Ad invicem expectandum dicit, ut multorum oblatio simul celebretur. Comm. in 1 Ep. ad Cor. xi. 33, 4. Op. AMBROS. Tom. 2. App. col. 150. ed. Bened.

² Episcopos ab eo placuit qui non communicat munera accipere non debere. Concil. Elib. can. 28.

³ Ὅρα γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐχομεν τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἡμεῖς τὸν ἱερέα, ἡμεῖς τὴν θυσίαν οὐκοῦν τοιαύτας ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίας τὰς ἐν ἐκείνῳ δυναμένας προσφερεσθαι τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ οὐκετι πρόβατα καὶ βοᾶς, οὐκετι αἷμα καὶ κνίσσαν· πάντα ταῦτα λεύεται, καὶ ἀντίεισηνηκεται ἀντὶ τούτων ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία. τί δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία; τὰ διὰ ψυχῆς, τὰ διὰ πνεύματος. CHRYS. In Hebr. hom. xi. § 3. Tom. xii. pp. 114, 115. ed. Ben.

⁴ Μνημὴν καὶ ἡμῖν παραδούς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν. EUSEB. Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. ult. p. 38. ed. Col. 1688.

⁵ Τούτου δὴτα τοῦ θυμᾶτος τὴν μνημὴν ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβολῶν. Ib. p. 39.

sacrifices, thus speaking of them; ‘Sacrifice to God the sacrifices of praise, &c.’ And again, ‘The lifting up of hands is the evening sacrifice.’ And again, ‘The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit.’¹ God having rejected the Mosaic sacrifices proclaims by the prophetic voice that which is to be observed by us, saying, ‘From the rising of the sun to its setting, my name is glorified among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure sacrifice.’ Therefore we sacrifice to the supreme God the sacrifice of praise; we sacrifice a divinely-inspired, and holy, and pious sacrifice; we sacrifice in a new way, according to the New Testament, a pure sacrifice. But it is said that ‘the sacrifice of God is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart God will not despise.’² And, moreover, we offer up the prophetic incense, presenting to him in every place the sweet-smelling fruit of a virtuous religion; offering it through our prayers to him. This also another prophet teaches, who said, ‘Let my prayer be as incense in thy sight.’ Therefore we both sacrifice and offer incense; at one time celebrating the memory of the great sacrifice, according to the mysteries delivered by him, and offering to God the offering of thanksgiving (την ευχαριστιαν) for our salvation, in pious hymns and prayers; at another, consecrating ourselves wholly to him.”³

No one, I suppose, can read this passage without admitting that, according to its author, the *immaterial* and *mental* sacrifice in the eucharist was that in which the eucharistic sacrifice at least principally consisted.⁴

¹ Ταυτας δε παλιν τας ασωματους και νοερας θυσιαις τα προφητικα κηρυττει λογια, ωδεπη περιεχοντα, Θυσον τω Θεω θυσιαν αινεσεως, κ. τ. λ. Ib. p. 39.

² Θυομεν δητα τοιγαρουν τω επι παντων Θεω θυσιαν αινεσεως· θυομεν το ενθεον και σεμνον και ιεροπρεπες θυμη. Θυομεν καινως κατα την καινην Διαθηκην την καθαρων θυσιαν. Θυσια δε τω Θεω πνευμα συντετριμμενον, κ. τ. λ. Ib. p. 40.

³ Ουκουν και θυομεν και θυμιωμεν τοτε μεν την μνημην του μεγαλου θυματος κατι τα προς αυτου παραδοθεντα μυστηρια επιτελουντες, και την υπερ σωτηριας ημων ευχαριστιαν δι’ ευσεβων ὕμνων τε και ευχων τω Θεω προσκομιζοντες· τοτε δε σφας αντους δλωκαθιερουντες αυτω. Ib. p. 40.

⁴ Many other passages might be adduced to the same effect. The reader will

And hence (3) the people were considered as much the sacrificers as the priest, with the mere exception of the external act of ministration.

For this we need nothing more than the testimony of Leo, who speaking of the propriety of having the eucharist celebrated more than once in the day on a great festival, if the communicants were so numerous that they were not all able to communicate at one and the same time, says, "Some part of the people would necessarily be deprived of the opportunity of performing their devotions if, by preserving the custom of having one mass only, they alone who assembled together in the early part of the day should be able *to offer the sacrifice*." ¹ "By which words," says our opponents' witness, Bishop Jewel, "Leo teacheth us plainly that the sacrifice is offered no less by the people than by the priest." ² And again; "As this Council," i. e. of Toledo, "saith, the priest offereth the sacrifice at the altar or holy table, even so Leo saith, every of the whole faithful people likewise offereth up the same sacrifice. I say not any other, but the very self-same sacrifice, and that in as ample manner as it is offered by the priest." ³

And thus in St. Mark's Liturgy it is said, "Receive, O God, . . . the eucharistical praises of those that offer sacrifices and oblations to thee." ⁴

Observable also is the testimony of Chrysostom. "Moreover," he says, "the prayer of thanksgiving in the eucharist is common both to the people and the priest; for the priest does not give thanks alone, but also all the

find, for instance, the passage alluded to in a former page from Cyril Alex. in his answer to Julian (lib. x. pp. 343, 345, 350. Op. tom. vi. Aubert.) well worth referring to.

¹ Necesse est autem ut quædam pars populi sua devotione privetur, si, unius tantum missæ more servato, *sacrificium offerre* non possit [possint], nisi qui prima diei parte convenerint. LEON. Ep. ad. Dioscor. Ep. Alexandr. ep. 81. ed. Lugd. 1633. p. 150.

² Reply to Harding. Art. 13. Works, p. 360.

³ Ib. p. 366.

⁴ See Brett's Collection of Liturgies, p. 33.

people.”¹ The whole context is worth consulting on this matter. This expression, be it observed, is that which is used by Justin Martyr,² to signify the mode in which the elements were blessed previous to their reception, and therefore this passage of Chrysostom shows that, even in this part of the service, the priest was only acting as the leader of the devotions of the people.

(4) The direct benefit to be derived from the celebration of the eucharist was to be expected only by the communicants.

“If,” saith Ambrose, “as often as the blood is poured out, it is poured out for the remission of sins, *I ought always to receive it*, IN ORDER THAT *my sins may always be remitted*. I who constantly sin ought constantly to have the remedy.”³

“In vain,” saith Chrysostom, complaining of the people’s non-attendance at the eucharist, “is the daily sacrifice, in vain do we stand at the altar, there is no one who communicates.”⁴ But it would have been far from being in vain, if thereby remission of sins was obtained for the Church.

Moreover the antient practice of sending the consecrated bread and wine to those that were absent, whatever may be thought of it in other respects, strongly shows the feeling of the primitive Church in this matter; which is also witnessed to by its strictness in expecting and requiring all who were competent to receive the eucharist to communicate whenever it was administered.

These are but a few of the testimonies that might be adduced to show the opposition of the Fathers to the views

¹ Τα της ευχαριστίας παλιν κοινα’ ουδε γαρ εκεινος ευχαριστεί μονος, αλλά και ὁ λαὸς ἅπας. CHRYS. In Ep. 2. ad Corinth. hom. 18. tom. x. p. 568.

² See p. 163 above.

³ Si quotiescumque effunditur sanguis, in remissionem peccatorum funditur, debeo illum semper accipere, ut semper mihi peccata dimittantur. Qui semper pecco, semper debeo habere medicinam. AMBROS. De Sacram. lib. iv. c. 6. tom. ii. col. 372. ed. Ben.

⁴ Εἰκη θυσία καθημερινή, εἰκη παρεστήκαμεν θυσιαστηρίῳ· οὐδεὶς δὲ μετεχών. CHRYS. In Eph. hom. iii. § 4. tom. xi. p. 23. ed. Ben.

of our opponents; and however much their inaccurate and hyperbolical language may often perplex the inquirer, an impartial review of their sentiments as a whole would, I am convinced, satisfy him that the weight of patristical testimony is overwhelmingly against both the Romanists and our opponents; and this, be it remembered, is all for which I contend in any point, as I make no pretensions to the support of "everybody always everywhere."

The Fathers, as a body, while they speak (and justly) of the offering up of the real body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, and attribute the impetration of remission of sins to such a sacrifice alone, show at the same time their total dissent from the doctrine of transubstantiation, by speaking of the bread and wine as being still bread and wine after consecration; and while some of them perhaps maintain the propriety of an offering up of the bread and wine to God after consecration, as symbolically the body and blood of Christ, they show at the same time their dissent from the notion that the act of the priest in doing this is even instrumentally the procuring cause of any remission of sins, by speaking of the sacrifice as consisting principally in that *mental* offering of Christ's sacrifice in the prayers and praises of the hearts of the worshippers, which no one can offer for another.

"As for the antient Fathers," says Bishop Morton, "who in their objected testimonies talked of Christ suffering being slain and dying in the eucharist, we Protestants subscribe to their judgments with a full faith, in acknowledgment that Christ's death, the proper work of our propitiation, is the only object of our *remembrance and faith*."¹

I would observe, then, upon this head, lastly, that it is strictly true, in a sense, that the real sacrifice of the cross, the true body and blood of Christ, are offered up in the eucharist, not by iteration, but in the prayers of the faithful. Nay more, remission of sins can only be ob-

¹ Of the Lord's Supper, ed. 1652, bk. 6. c. 10. p. 479.

tained by the offering up of the true sacrifice of the cross. And how can this be offered up? Confessedly not in the external offering up of the consecrated bread and wine, unless we maintain the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is only, and can only be, offered spiritually in the prayers and thanksgivings of the faithful. And hence, again, it follows, that no remission of sins can be obtained by any external symbolical offering of consecrated bread and wine, or by any one individual for another.¹

¹ The importance of the subject treated of above has led me to enlarge upon it beyond what the limits of this work would strictly have permitted; and it has been still impossible to do more than to discuss it in its principal features; and to expose the inaccuracies, misrepresentations, and confusion of the Tract upon which I have commented, would require more space than they are worth. The Tractators appear to have hastily imbibed certain notions from the writings of Brett and Johnson, and one or two more of kindred views, and then, without even giving themselves time fully to understand the nature and consequences of the tenets to which they have thus pledged themselves, to have been led away by a *partial* similarity in *language* in other writers to claim a host in their favour who are altogether opposed to them. Thus Mr. Keble regrets in our Liturgy the absence of "the solemn offering of the elements *before* consecration," (Pref. to Hooker, p. lxii.) which is not absent. And, moreover, the oblation which, according to their views, forms the eucharistic oblation, is that of the bread and wine *after* consecration. Let me commend to their notice the following statement of the doctrine they have undertaken to defend by one of the party from whom they appear to have derived it. "Under the gospel, when the bishop or priest hath received the people's offered materials for the Christian sacrifice, and has made a priestly oblation of them, they are then prepared to be made a sacrifice, and then the priest pronounceth the words of institution over them, and imitateth the actions of our blessed Lord, by which the priest's power to consecrate by commission is shewed, and the sacred symbols become consecrated, as far as is in the power of man to do by commission; and *then* they are fit to be offered up to God by the priest in sacrifice for all the purposes of the institution; and they are accordingly *offered up in sacrifice* to God the Father, as commemorative of and in union with the one great sacrifice once offered by Jesus Christ of himself upon the cross. And this is the proper oblation and sacrifice, which may be called the third oblation, for the other two are neither of them a sacrifice, [i. e. the oblation of the people in presenting the bread and wine, and the oblation of the priest in placing them on the altar;] but this third oblation is a sacrifice, and in the primitive Liturgies is so called *at this period of the service, and not before*; and by the concomitant sacrificial prayer the priest begs of God the Father that he would please to do what none but he can do, to send down the Holy Ghost upon the offered sacrifice, that the sacred and now in part consecrated symbols may, by his effectual operation, become verily and indeed the

4thly, It is maintained that, by this sacrifice so offered, an additional refreshment is obtained for the souls of the dead in the intermediate state.

This is a question which more immediately concerns the point we have next to consider; to which, therefore,

most precious body and blood of Christ to the receivers. Then the Holy Eucharist is fully consecrated, and energetical for all the divine purposes of the institution; so that now it is a full, perfect, and proper sacrifice of the body of Christ broken, and of his blood shed. All Christians, the whole Catholic Church, the whole communion of saints, are concerned in it, for *thereby* God the Father is *propitiated* for the *whole mystical body of Christ*, living and departed, as it is a sacrifice united to the one great sacrifice, of which all the legal sacrifices were but types."¹

There is one more point, however, to which I would here direct the reader's notice, in order to show him to what such views lead. In the eucharist the minister confessedly is to follow the example of our Lord when he instituted it, and consequently, if the one offers a true propitiatory sacrifice to God in it, so did the other. But Scripture tells us that Christ was "*once offered*," and that "*by his one offering he hath perfected, &c.*" This, when pressed home, was an argument not easily to be evaded, and accordingly the great defender of the views of our opponents, Mr. Johnson, found himself compelled to take refuge in the assertion that our Lord's sacrifice was made in the eucharist. "Our Saviour," he says, "laid down his life when by a free act of his will he did give his body and blood to God *in the eucharist*." (Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 69.) And against *the sacrifice of the cross* it is pleaded (I quote from Dr. Waterland) that to suppose it "*is to render the sacrifice of Christ a bloody one indeed; so bloody as that it cannot be reconciled to purity of any sort, till killing one's self be esteemed a virtue*." (Unbl. Sacr. part ii. p. 70.) And thus speaks Dr. Brett, "He could not *offer himself a sacrifice* in any other manner than by *symbols or representations*; for had he in any manner put himself to death, he might have been too justly accused of *self-murder*." (Brett's Answ. to plain Acc. p. 66.) I forbear offering any remark upon such statements, except to remind the reader that these are two of our opponents' most favoured witnesses, and their works on the list of the Library of *Anglo-Catholic* divines. The reader who desires to enter further into the matter may consult Dr. Waterland's Appendix to his "Christian Sacrifice explained" in the 8th vol. of his Works. He will do well also to consult his "Sacramental part of the eucharist explained," and "Distinctions of Sacrifice," in the same volume. He will there see also some just observations upon that *approximation* to the doctrine of *transubstantiation* which some of our opponents' favourite witnesses had shortly before that time broached, and which I need not say have been revived by their admirers of the present day, but into which it would be beside our present subject to enter.

¹ Hon. A. Campbell's "Essay upon the Holy Eucharist," in his Treatise on the Middle State, pp. 307, 8. Lond. 1721. fol. See, also, Brett's Dissert. on the prim. Liturg. p. 121; and L'Estrange's All. of Div. Off. p. 183. ed. 1690.

we refer the reader; and we shall there prove that the prayers for the dead, made by the antients, were (to use the language of Bishop Morton,) only “thankful congratulations for their present joys, or else testimonies of their hope and desires of their future resurrection, and consummation of their blessedness, both in their bodies and souls.”¹

Such prayers were always made at the celebration of the Eucharist, and most properly; for at what time could we more appropriately introduce such supplications, than on such an occasion; and hence it was that the Eucharist came to be often celebrated in the primitive Church at the burial of the dead, when these prayers might be considered as having a peculiar reference to the person whose body had just been interred; and so in our own Church, in the time of Queen Elizabeth (a. 1560), a form for the “*celebratio cœnæ Domini in Funebribus, si amici et vicini defuncti communicare velint*,” was issued by royal authority.² And hence the term “oblations for the dead,” frequently to be met with in Tertullian and Cyprian, meaning celebrations of the Eucharist (which was called *the oblation*) with a particular reference to a person deceased, in which, probably, was offered a thanksgiving for the blessings vouchsafed him during life, and a prayer that he might attain a happy resurrection, and find mercy at the day of judgment, and be admitted to that perfect state of happiness which then awaits the just.

There remains for our consideration one more doctrine for which it is said that we are indebted to tradition; viz.

That there is an intermediate state, in which the souls of the faithful are purified, and grow in grace; that they pray for us, and that our prayers benefit them; words, whose meaning is so elastic, that it is difficult precisely to know what the doctrine intended to be conveyed by them is, as they might be understood so as to include almost the whole Romish doctrine of Purgatory.

As this is a matter of no little interest and importance,

¹ Cath. App. ii. 8. § 2. p. 190.

² Wilk. Concil. iv. 217. or Sparrow's Collection of Articles, &c.

and there may be mistakes in both extremes respecting it, we shall devote a few pages to the consideration of it.

In the first place, however, I must repeat the remark, that any teaching upon this subject, which depends upon patristical statements for its authority, is as uncertain and unauthoritative as are those statements. All which we receive as *certain* on the point, is grounded upon the declarations of Scripture; and however little Scripture may be supposed to have revealed respecting it, with that little we must rest satisfied, as all that can be *certainly* known respecting it; nor has our Church, as far as I am aware, laid down anything respecting it, which Scripture does not teach. It is a point, however, in which men may differ somewhat in opinion; and one may see more, and another less, in Scripture; and consequently the faith of men may vary in extent, inasmuch as Scripture has not spoken so clearly on this point, as on those that are more essential to us. There are, nevertheless, *limits* which Scripture will not allow us to pass in our notions on this matter; limits which the Romanists have grievously transgressed; and therefore it is very necessary to define and limit the meaning of words used in common. The Romanists, when they speak of the doctrine of the intermediate state, mean their tenet of purgatory; and it is to be feared that the doctrine which our opponents hold on this subject, is not sufficiently dissimilar; while, nevertheless, the doctrine that there is an intermediate state in which the souls of the just are, between their death and resurrection, different from that in which they will be placed after the day of judgment, is, in my belief, clearly deducible from Scripture; and that, *by long residence in such a state, such souls attain a higher degree of sanctification than they had upon entering it*, seems to be a truth that necessarily flows from the acknowledged *character* of that state. Moreover, if the dead in Christ await the period of the resurrection and judgment to be put in possession of that heavenly inheritance in which they will again enjoy communion with the Father, then is there no

impropriety in the Church on earth praying that both the faithful on earth, and those in the intermediate state, may be hereafter put into the possession of that inheritance ; and this, *in a sense*, is praying for the dead ; and appears to be what some of the antients, who adopted that practice, meant ; but vastly different in meaning to the Romish notions on the subject.

I will now endeavour to show that the doctrine of the intermediate state may be proved from Scripture.

“ When the Son of man shall come in his glory,” saith our Lord, “ with all the holy angels, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them, &c. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit the kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world, &c.” (See Matt. xxv. 31, et seq.) Is it not apparent from this passage that the righteous do not “ inherit the kingdom ” until after this sentence at the day of judgment ? It cannot surely be said that the righteous come from the possession of that kingdom to be placed at the bar only to be sent back to it ?

And this is still more apparent from a passage of St. Peter, where, speaking of the promised inheritance of the saints, he calls it “ an inheritance . . . reserved in heaven for you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed *in the last time*,” adding, “ Be sober and hope to the end, for the grace that is to be brought unto you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ*.” (1 Pet. i. 4, 5, 13.)

Indeed, that the saints should be brought up to judgment after having been put in possession of the promised inheritance, or, which is equivalent, that they should be put in possession of that inheritance before judgment is passed upon them, seems to render the judgment nugatory and useless. And the notion of a particular judgment at the time of death, which some have entertained, has, as far as I am aware, no support in Scripture. On the

contrary, judgment is, I think, always connected with the final day of account. "He that rejecteth me," saith our Lord, "and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him *in the last day*." (John xii. 48.) The notion of any other judgment than that which is to take place at the last day is a mere figment of the imagination.

Moreover, the period of the resurrection and judgment is the period everywhere pointed out in the Scriptures as that to which our eyes should be directed as *the day of reward*. "When thou makest a feast, call the poor, &c., and thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just*." (Luke xiv. 13, 14.) "Who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life. But unto them that are contentious . . . indignation, &c. *In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel*." (Rom. ii. 6—16.) "That the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." (1 Cor. v. 5.) "To you who are troubled rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels," &c. (See 2 Thess. i. 7, et seq.) "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me *at that day*: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.) "When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." (1 Pet. v. 4.) "The nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and thou *shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name*," &c. (Rev. xi. 18.)

Now these passages, and many others of like import might be added to them, seem clearly to show that the

great promised reward is not to be expected by the servants of Christ until the day of judgment after the resurrection, and consequently that until that period they are in a different state to that in which they will be placed afterwards.

That there is, however, a state of rest and peace into which the souls of believers are admitted at their death, is evident from our Lord's parable of the rich man and Lazarus, where he tells us that Lazarus when he died was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom, (Luke xvi. 23,) which is evidently a metaphorical expression, signifying a state of rest and happiness, and is used by many of the Fathers to express the intermediate state of the righteous, as indeed it was among the Jews in our Saviour's time. There is also a passage in the Book of Revelation, which, while it seems clearly to show that the martyrs themselves await the period of the resurrection for their full reward, also indicates that they are in a state of consciousness and of happiness. "When he had opened the fifth seal," it is said, "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also, and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." (Rev. vi. 9—11.) In this state, then, they are to remain until the end, when they and all their brethren are to receive their reward together.

And the existence of this intermediate state of rest is further confirmed by our Lord's promise to the dying penitent thief, "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," (Luke xxiii. 43,) the soul of Christ being about to descend to *hades* for the period between his death and resurrection. (Acts ii. 27, 31.)

And in like manner the souls of the wicked, though in

a state of suffering, are not in that state in which they will be placed after the judgment, for they also await the decision of the great day of account to receive their full punishment, however much their present state may be, and no doubt is (like that of the righteous) an earnest of that which surely awaits them. For "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that *every one may receive* the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good *or bad*." (2 Cor. v. 10.) "And God *reserves* the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." (2 Pet. ii. 9.) See also Rom. ii. 6—16.

And when the rich sinner died, he lifted up his eyes in *hades*, and was in torments, (Luke xvi. 23;) but after the final judgment the wicked will be cast into "the lake of fire," (την λιμνην του πυρος) (Rev. xx. 15,) that lake in which *hades* itself is to be swallowed up. (ver. 14.)

And this word *hades* seems to be the name for the intermediate place of *all* departed spirits, for in the same place, though in a different division of it, was the soul of Lazarus in a state of rest and peace; and to the same place went the soul of our Saviour between his death and resurrection, (Acts ii. 27, 31;) and at the final judgment death and *hades* deliver up the dead that are in them, who are judged every man according to their works, (Rev. xx. 13;) and hence St. Paul, when contemplating the resurrection of *the saints*, says, "O *hades*, where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv. 55.)¹ And of this place our Lord

¹ The word *hell*, sometimes used by our translators to express *hades*, is, in its proper signification (in which, perhaps, our translators also have used it in Acts ii. 27, 31, and Rev. xx. 13,) exactly expressive of the meaning given above to the word *hades*, though unfortunately it has become almost exclusively appropriated to a more limited sense. In its primary and original signification, says Lord King, "It imports no more than *an invisible and hidden place*, being derived from the old Saxon word *hil*, which signifies to *hide*, or from the participle thereof, *hilled*, that is to say, *hidden* or *covered*; as in the western parts of England at this very day, to *hele* over any thing signifies, amongst the common people, to *cover* it . . . From whence it appears that the word *hell*, according to its primitive notion, exactly answers to the Greek word *hâēs*, *hades*, which signifies *the common mansion of all separated souls*,

is said to have the keys, (Rev. i. 18,) doubtless with reference to that power by which, at the last day, he will call out of it the souls of the departed, to reunite them to their bodies, when death and hades shall deliver up the dead that are in them, (Rev. xx. 13;) and thus the gates of hades shall not prevail over his Church, (Matt. xvi. 18;) for though for a time they shall detain it, yet at the period of the resurrection it shall be called thence by him who has the keys of those gates in his hands; and *then* it shall be said, "O hades, where is thy victory?"

If, then, these Scriptures show that there is such an intermediate state, in which the souls of the faithful remain in a holy and happy condition till the period of the resurrection and judgment, then their progressive sanctification in such a state seems a necessary consequence; and, moreover, a prayer that they and we may ultimately attain a happy resurrection, and find mercy at the day of judgment, is only a prayer for blessings for which we are taught to pray. The purification which such a state is calculated to produce is no improbable mode of preparation to make us meet for and capable of the full enjoyment of the beatific vision of God in the state which will succeed the judgment. But the only purification, be it observed, of which we here speak, is that which *necessarily results from a residence in* such a state as that in which *the Scriptures assure us* the souls of the faithful departed are placed, namely, *a state of rest, peace, and holiness*, from which the wicked are excluded. And the only prayers of which we speak with commendation are such as the declarations of Scripture authorize. And the prayers of which we have here spoken were, as Arch-

and was so called quasi *ὁ αἰδης τοπος*, because it is *an unseen place*, removed from the sight and view of the living, according to which the translator of Irenæus renders it by *an invisible place* (*invisibilem locum*, lib. v. c. 26.)" King's History of the Apostles' Creed, c. iv. pp. 191, 2. ed. 1719; where see more. In the older version of the Psalms, in the Book of Common Prayer, there is a very clear instance of its use in this sense. "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death: and shall he deliver his soul from the hand of hell?" (Ps. lxxxix. 48.)

bishop Usher has shown, precisely those which were made in the antient Church in their commemorations for the dead. Having noticed some of these prayers, the Archbishop says,—“ In these, and other prayers of the like kind, we may desery evident footsteps of the primary intentions of the Church in her supplications for the dead; which was, that the whole man, not the soul separated only, might receive public remission of sins, and a solemn acquittal in the judgment of that great day, and so obtain both a full escape from all the consequences of sin,—the last enemy being now destroyed, and death swallowed up in victory,—and a perfect consummation of bliss and happiness.”¹ And again,—“ The Church, in her commemorations and prayers, had relation . . . unto those that led their lives in such a godly manner as gave pregnant hope unto the living that their souls were at rest with God; and to such as these alone did it wish *the accomplishment of that which remained of their redemption; to wit, their public justification and solemn acquittal at the last day, and their perfect consummation of bliss, both in body and soul, in the kingdom of heaven for ever after.* Not that the event of these things was conceived to be any ways doubtful, for we have been told that things may be prayed for, the event whereof is known to be most certain, but because the commemoration thereof was thought to serve for special use, not only in regard of the manifestation of the affection of the living toward the dead, (he that prayed, as Dionysius noteth, *desiring other men’s gifts as if they were his own graces,*) but also in respect of the consolation and instruction which the living might receive thereby.”² And so Bishop Morton, speaking of these prayers, says,—“ What can all these prayers else signify, but *thankful congratulations for their present joys, or else testimonies of their hope and desires of their future resurrection, and consummation of their bles-*

¹ Answer to Jesuit, pp. 154, 5.

² Usher’s Answer to the Jesuit’s Challenge, p. 178. See the whole of his observations on “ Prayer for the dead,” in pp. 133—91.

sedness, both in their bodies and souls." (Catholic Appeal, ii. 8. § 2. p. 190.)¹

And so far our Church seems to encourage the practice, when, in her service for the burial of the dead, she teaches us to pray that God would "shortly accomplish the number of his elect, and *hasten his kingdom*, that we, *with all those that are departed in the true faith of his holy name*, may have our *perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul*, in his eternal and everlasting glory." Here is a clear reference to that more perfect state of happiness in which the saints of God are to be placed after the union of body and soul, in the resurrection, and a prayer that that period may shortly arrive, and that we, *with* those who have departed out of this life, may then be put in possession of that happiness. But the prayers which went further than this in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., were on the revision cancelled.

But our opponents,—though certainly differing from the Romanists in this matter, yet nevertheless—are not contented to leave the matter thus, but will presume to know more than Scripture has revealed respecting the nature of that state, and assert that those in the intermediate state may be benefited, that is, may gain an increase of happiness, by our prayers, and that they pray for us, laying this down moreover as the doctrine of "the Church," and thus, as demanding our belief, rashly intruding into things not revealed. What is the authority upon which it is asserted that it is the doctrine of "the Church," that the condition of souls in the intermediate state can be altered or benefited by our prayers, or that they pray for us? To put it even upon the consentient testimony of the Fathers, is out of the question, for, as we have seen, we have not their consent for an intermediate state at all. Nay, Archbishop Usher has shown that in the question, "Whether the dead did receive *any* peculiar profit" by

¹ I would here observe, that Bishop Morton is opposed even to what I have admitted above as to the doctrine of the intermediate state. See his Cath. App. ii. 8. § 5. p. 193.

the prayers made for them, there was "great difference among the doctors;"¹ and that so late as the eighth century, even the *lawfulness* of offering oblations for the dead, was a question;² and hence, the Archbishop reckons it "*a private conceit* entertained by divers, as well of the elder as of the middle times, in their devotions for the dead," that "*an augmentation of glory* might thereby be procured for the saints;" quoting, as an example of this opinion, the words of Ivo Carnotensis, "It doth not seem *idle* if we make intercessions for those who already enjoy rest, *that their rest may be increased*;"³ where the notion, we may observe, though advocated, is not put forward with any confidence.

Here, however, as in other cases, this "private conceit" of divers antient doctors is solemnly laid down by our opponents as the doctrine of "the Church," and to it they have added as part also of "the Church's" doctrine, that the departed saints pray for us, for which they have even less to offer in the way of testimony than in the former case. And this is not the less remarkable from the fact that Archbishop Usher's whole discussion of this subject, in his Answer to the Jesuit, has been reprinted in the 72d. of the "Tracts for the Times," which shows that these statements of our opponents have been made in the face of evidence placed before them, that there was no patristical consent for them; an inconsistency which, however surprising, is in such cases by no means uncommon. But it is *both surprising and uncommon* that it should be said, in the face of the Archbishop's observations given above, "That the prayers of the living benefit the dead in Christ, is, to say the least, not inconsistent, as USHER SHOWS US, with *the primitive belief*."⁴ Such an observation I would rather content myself with pointing out, than venturing to comment upon.⁵

¹ Answer to the Jesuit, pp. 186, &c.

² Ib. p. 190.

³ Ib. p. 168.

⁴ Tract 79, On Purgatory, p. 5.

⁵ There is a painful want both of accuracy and of ingenuousness in the writings of our opponents. On this very subject, the observations of Dr.

Nor apparently is their doctrine, as to the nature of the intermediate state, so different to that of the Romanists as they would fain represent it to be. True, they blame the Romanists for making it a place of suffering, but they would have spoken more consistently if they had only blamed them for making it a place of *so much* suffering as they do, for it is but a question of degree with them, as the observations they have made in their Tract on Purgatory (Tract 79) fully show. They there admit that they hold with the Romanists, "that the great majority die in God's favour, yet more or less under *the bond of their sins*," because "after baptism there is no plenary pardon of sins in this life to the sinner, however penitent, such as in baptism was once vouchsafed to him," adding, "If for sins committed after baptism we have not yet received a simple and unconditional absolution, surely penitents from this time *up to the day of judgment*, may be considered in that double state of which the Romanists speak, their persons accepted, but *certain sins uncanceled*." And they then quote the case of David (2 Sam. xii. 13, 14,) as "a perspicuous instance of a penitent restored to God's favour at once, yet *his sin afterwards visited*," from which, if the case has any pertinency to the point in question, we are of course left to conclude that the uncanceled sins of believers may be visited by punishments in the intermediate state, and they may therefore well add, "So far then we cannot be said materially to oppose the Ro-

Pusey, in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, (pp. 186 &c.) are wanting in candour, because they do not point out any distinction in the nature of the prayers offered for the dead *except* such as are "connected with the modern doctrine of purgatory," and then make use of Archbishop Usher's name, as if he had taken the same view with the writers of the Tracts, for whom this Letter was written as a defence. Again, "Both Romanist and ultra-Protestant," he complains, "dogmatize about the state of departed souls." But what is the meaning of this complaint in a defender of the statements we have quoted above? Is it correct also to say that "the ultra-protestant . . . decides peremptorily that the departed saints are already in full possession of the joys of heaven," when he must be perfectly aware of the freely conceded difference of opinion on this subject among those whom he calls ultra-protestants?

manists." (pp. 6, 7.) Doubtless they cannot. *And out of these notions have arisen all the abuses to which the Romish Purgatory has given rise.*

Nor is this doctrine of praying for the dead, that their happiness may be increased, that is, that the limitation placed to their happiness, in consequence of their sins, may be removed, or, that the punishment of their sins may be remitted, one of small moment; because it tends to encourage the living to hope that if only they are such as will escape the place of torment, they may obtain an increase of happiness in the intermediate state, by the prayers of the Church after their death; which, not to say that it is a hope altogether without foundation, is not unlikely to have a very injurious effect upon the Christian walk and conversation. As Bishop Morton says,—“We are justly stayed from performing any such kindness, which, instead of showing love unto the dead, might seduce the living with deceivable hopes of succour after their death.”¹

To these “traditionary” doctrines Romanists add, among others, the doctrine of Christ’s descent into hell, and that of the validity of baptism performed by heretics.

The latter we have already considered,² and shown to have been a controverted point in the antient Church.

Of the former, we say with Bishop Pearson, that when the Apostle, quoting Ps. xvi. 8—10, says that David there “spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption,” (Acts ii. 25, 26, 27, 30, 31,) “from this place the Article is *clearly* and *INFALLIBLY* deduced thus: If the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection; but it was not there before his death; therefore upon or after his death, and before his resurrection, the soul of Christ descended into hell.” And he proceeds to quote Augustine (Ep. 99. al. 164. § 3.) as referring to this passage as a clear and undeniable proof of the doctrine. (On the Creed. Art. 5.)

¹ Cath. App. ii. 8. p. 194.

² See vol. i. pp. 330, &c.

There remain to be considered the cases that relate to certain matters of fact, and points that do not *immediately* belong either to the doctrines or rites of Christianity; namely,

- (1) The Canon of Scripture.
- (2) That Melchizedek's feast is a type of the Eucharist.
- (3) That the Book of Canticles represents the union between Christ and his Church.
- (4) That Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs, refers to the Second Person of the Trinity.
- (5) The alleged *perpetual* virginity of the Mother of our Lord.

To the first of these we have already devoted a previous chapter. The second and fourth we have also considered in a former chapter, and shown that, so far from our being indebted to tradition for any certain testimony respecting them, the Fathers themselves were not agreed on the subject;¹ which shows how easily men may deceive themselves in fancying consent of Fathers, where nevertheless it does not exist. As it respects the third, the sole question is, Has this book sufficient evidence for its being received as part of the Canon of Scripture? If so, it refers to religion, and has a spiritual meaning; which is all we "*know* with tolerable *certainty* about the matter," or need to know to show us what it is the allegory represents.

One point remains, viz., the alleged perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord.

It is with much unwillingness that I enter upon the discussion of this point, lest I should appear to any one to speak slightly of one so highly honoured of God; and to whom, if upon earth, we should be disposed to pay higher reverence and respect, than to the most potent empress that ever sat upon an earthly throne. Far be it from us to speak with any degree of levity with respect to one so "highly favoured" of God, and whom "all generations shall call blessed."

¹ See vol. i. pp. 360—363.

But, let me ask, what possible meaning can they have who connect this matter with religion? What possible bearing can such a point have upon faith or piety? How, moreover, was it ascertained? Will our opponents venture to assert that it was divinely revealed to the Apostles, and by them delivered to the Church? If not, who could know anything about it? for it is at least clear from Scripture, that Joseph took her to wife, and that they lived together as in that relationship; though he “knew her not *till* she had brought forth her *firstborn* Son;” (Matt. i. 25;) which words, by the way, notwithstanding the criticism which Basil proposes as a way of getting over the difficulty, are clearly rather favourable to the notion of union after that birth. But be that as it may, all that we protest against, and what we do earnestly protest against, is, the laying down such a point, as one that has any connexion with piety or religion in any way, when it has no more connexion with them than the colour of her dress. The blue hood with which she is generally depicted might as well be made an article of religious belief; unless, indeed, the authority of the primitive Father, Clement of Alexandria, shall prevail in favour of white, which he seems to think the only proper colour for Christians;¹ and so the blue (which, by the way, is one of those he particularly excepts against) be voted heretical. And this, forsooth, is one of the great recommendations of “tradition,” that to it, as Mr. Newman reminds us, we are altogether indebted for this doctrine! Whether “tradition” *has* delivered it, we shall see presently. But wherein does the religion of it consist? Is it in the supposed honour thus done to the Mother of our Lord? I know not why the contrary supposition should be considered dishonourable to her, under the circumstances in which she was placed, as one living with Joseph as his wife. Or is it in the honour paid to certain Fathers, in our receiving whatever they deliver to us? If this is religion, we must add many

¹ See his *Pædag.* lib. ii. c. 10. pp. 234, 5, and lib. iii. c. 11. pp. 285, 6. ed. Potter.

more such notions to our articles of belief to be religious. Granting even that it is more honourable to the Mother of our Lord to suppose that she remained separate from her husband to the end of her life, what we inquire is, Of what moment is the knowledge of such a fact to us? No one, I suppose, will presume to say that it is a *revealed* fact; in which case I admit that the fact of its being revealed should be sufficient to prevent our asking such a question. But if it be not a revealed fact, then such a question may fairly be asked. Nor is it a matter of little moment that such points should be imposed upon Christians, as matters which they *ought* to believe; and of sufficient importance even to recommend "tradition" to us as being the only medium by which such *truths* can be made known to us. They are a snare and a burthen to the conscience, which men have no right to impose under the sacred name of "the Church;" when they are in fact, or at least can only be traced to, the mere private fancies of individuals. Any one who will cast his eye over Genadius's list of the doctrines of "the Church," will at once see how this name has been abused.

Nay more; how stand the testimonies of the Fathers on this point? The only Father that can be quoted on the subject, for the first two centuries and a half, is Tertullian; and he, instead of defending the doctrine, uses words which *confessedly* show that he believed the contrary.¹ And what reply does Jerome give to Helvidius, when quoting Tertullian in favour of this opinion? This only;—"That he did not belong to the Church."² But this is evidently no reply; because the errors that Tertullian had embraced, would have induced him to favour the doctrine of her perpetual virginity, if he had conceived himself to have had any ground for it. If there had been such a tradition, as Bishop Stillingfleet says, "one would

¹ Christum quidem Virgo enixa est, semel *nuptura post partum*. De Monogam. c. 8. p. 529. See also De vel. virg. c. 6. et De carne Christi. c. 23.

² De Tertulliano quidem nihil amplius dico quam Ecclesiæ hominem non fuisse. Adv. Helvid. § 17. Tom. 2. col. 225.

think that one so near the Apostles as Tertullian was, might easily have learned such a tradition; and so great a friend to virginity as he was, while a Montanist, should not have been apt to believe the contrary.”¹ It is clear, then, that at that time there was at least no general agreement in favour of the point.

Origen, I admit, speaks as if he thought it *probable*, and more honourable to the Mother of our Lord than the contrary supposition; but not as if it was any part of religion. “IF,” he says, “there was no son of Mary, *according to those who think soundly respecting her*, but Jesus; and Jesus says, &c. . .”²

This again shows that there was no consent in the Church at that time in favour of the opinion; though Origen, of course, thought that they took the *right* view who agreed with him. And this follows, also, from another passage, where Origen, having stated that some supposed that “the brethren” of Jesus were the children of Joseph, by a former wife, says,—“They who say this, are desirous of preserving the dignity of Mary in perpetual virginity and I think it is reasonable that of men, Jesus should be the first-fruits of the pureness of chastity, and of women, Mary.”³

And again, when meeting the strange notion that some had maintained, that Jesus denied Mary *because of her having married Joseph after his birth*, (which shows, at least, their view of the matter,) all that he ventures to affirm is, “Moreover they have no *proof* of what they assert, that she *married* after his birth;”⁴ though, by the good Father’s leave, it is plain enough from Scripture that

¹ Rational Account, &c. Pt. 1. c. 6. p. 165. ed. 1665.

² Εἰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς υἱὸς Μαρίας, κατὰ τοὺς ὕμνους περὶ αὐτῆς δοξαζοντας, ἡ Ἰησοῦς, φησὶ δὲ Ἰησοῦς τῇ μητρὶ, κ. τ. λ. ORIG. Tom. i. In Joh. § 6. vol. iv. p. 6.

³ Οἱ δὲ ταῦτα λεγοντες, τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς Μαρίας ἐν παρθένῳ τηρεῖν μέχρι τελοῦς βουλοῦνται καὶ οἱμὶ λόγον εἶναι, ἀνδρῶν μὲν καθαροῦτος τῆς ἐν ἀγνείᾳ ἀπαρχὴν γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, γυναικῶν δὲ τὴν Μαρίαν. ORIG. Tom. x. In Matt. § 17. vol. iii. p. 463.

⁴ Porro quod asserunt eam nupsisse post partum unde approbent non habent. ORIG. In Luc. hom. 7. vol. iii. p. 940.

Joseph and Mary lived together, as far as external appearances went, as man and wife; and possibly it might have been better for all parties if they had been contented there to leave it, without indulging an idle and impertinent curiosity about a matter which no way concerned them. And, to my mind, this appears to have been the feeling of Basil himself. For, commenting on the text, "He knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son," he says that this affords a ground for supposing that after the birth of Christ she did not remain a virgin, and adds, "But we, ALTHOUGH IT DOES NOT AT ALL OFFEND AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF PIETY, (for the virginity was necessary until her ministry in the fulfilment of the dispensation was performed, but *what happened afterwards is not to be curiously inquired into, as if it had anything to do with the doctrine of the mystery,*) yet, nevertheless, because the ears of the lovers of Christ do not like to entertain the idea that she who brought forth him who was God ever ceased to be a virgin, we think these testimonies sufficient."¹ He then proceeds to remark that the word *until* (*ἕως*) does not always denote a definite time, that is, limit what is spoken of to a certain time,² quoting in proof Matt. xxviii. 20. "Behold I am with you alway, even until the end of the world;" and also to refer to the tradition that Zacharias was killed by the Jews because he placed the Virgin Mary among the virgins in the temple after the birth of our Lord, which, however, as the Benedictine editors themselves admit, does not show that she always remained a virgin, and

¹ Τοῦτο δὲ ἤδη ὑπονοίαν παρέχει, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ καθαρῶς ὑπηρετήσασθαι τῇ γεννησίῃ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ ἐπιτελεσθείσῃ διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, τὰ νενομισμένα τοῦ γάμου ἔργα μὴ ἀπαρησαμένης τῆς Μαρίας· ἡμεῖς δὲ, εἰ καὶ μὴδὲν τῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραλυσμαίνεται λόγῳ, (μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑπηρεσίας ἀναγκῆς ἢ παρθενία, τὸ δὲ ἐφεξῆς ἀπολυπραγμοσύνην τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου,) ὁμῶς διὰ τὸ μὴ καταδεχέσθαι τῶν φιλοχριστῶν τὴν ἀκοήν, ὅτι ποτε ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἢ θεοτοκος, ἐκεῖνας ἡγουμένας τὰς μαρτυρίας ἀνταρκεῖς. BASIL. Homil. in sanct. Christi generat. § 5. Op. ed. Ben. tom. ii. pp. 599, 600.

² Epiphanius gives a different explanation of these words. See Adv. hæres. in hæres. 78. Antidic. § 20. tom. i. p. 1051.

which Origen himself does not quote as of any authority.¹ But the words with which Basil himself commences the subject (as quoted above) seem to indicate that he did not himself think his testimonies sufficient strictly to prove it. They at least show that he believed religion or piety to have nothing to do with the subject; and that he knew nothing of its being the tradition of the Church; and hence the reader will not be surprised to learn that his Homily has been thrown by the Benedictine Editors, without any good reason, into their Appendix as spurious, with a "*caute legendum*" in the margin.

Further; they who tell us that we are indebted altogether to tradition for this doctrine, if it may so be called, should remember that its earliest known defenders prove it, or rather attempt to prove it, from Scripture, and pretend not to any definite successional delivery of it from the Apostolical age. Such, for instance, is the case with Epiphanius,² who derives almost all his arguments on the subject from Scripture, and who, vehement as he is in some parts against the admission of the contrary supposition as dishonourable to the parties concerned, has evidently no notion of its being a matter affecting religion or piety, but was principally anxious that the *contrary* supposition should not be laid down as *a point of belief*. For thus he speaks,—"*Of what use is it to us,*" saith he, "*to inquire concerning it, even if she was united to Joseph, which we must not think? And which is preferable, to commit matters to God, or to force upon ourselves the worst? That it is not written that if we do not believe that Mary was afterwards united to Joseph, we shall not have eternal life, but come into judgment, is manifest . . . But men pass by necessary things, those that concern the truth of the faith, those that are connected with the glory of God, and*

¹ This story is given by Origen as a tradition which had come to his ears, (venit ad nos quædam traditio talis,) but he does not quote it as of any authority. (Comment. Series in Matth. n. 25. Op. tom. iii. p. 845, 6.)

² Adv. hæres., hæres. 78. Antidicomarian. Tom. i. pp. 1033—57.

heap to themselves things that tend to their hurt, from wherever they can find them. Alas! that it should be thought of, particularly when the Scripture does not speak of it. For if the Scripture had mentioned it we should have embraced the truth without hesitation. For marriage is not impure, the bed is not polluted; for is not ‘the bed undefiled?’ [Heb. xiii. 4.]”¹

This is very different from laying down the doctrine in question as one that has been handed down by “tradition,” and that concerns religion, and ought to be believed. And from this passage of Epiphanius we may see that the great object in view with those who wrote on this question was to protest against the *opposite* doctrine being laid down as one that *ought* to be held; and this perhaps was the reason why such hard names as heretic, &c. should be applied to Helvidius and the Antidicomarianitæ as they were called, viz. that they laid down their view of the matter as a doctrine of Scripture, and one that ought to be held, when in fact the point was not determined by adequate authority on either side; though after the controversy had arisen, and the majority of great names were enlisted in favour of the perpetual virginity, as that which was conceived to be most honourable to the mother of our Lord, then the name heretic began to be freely applied to those who did not positively maintain that doctrine.²

¹ Τι δε ωφελησεν ἡμας, εἰ καὶ συνηφθῇ, ὅπερ μὴ γένοιτο, περὶ τοῦ ζητεῖν; ποῖον δὲ μᾶλλον αἰρετώτερον, τὸ παραδόναι τὰ πρῶγματα Θεῷ, ἢ βιάζεσθαι ἡμῖν τὰ χεῖρονα; Ὅτι μὲν οὐκ ἐγράφη ἡμῖν, ὅτι εἰ μὴ πιστευσωμεν, ὅτι συνηφθῇ παλιν ἡ Μαρία, οὐκ ἐχομεν ζῶνι αἰώνιον, ἀλλὰ εἰς κρίμα ἐρχομεθα, δῆλον Εἰσάν δε οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὰ ἀναγκαιὰ, τὰ περὶ πίστεως ἀληθείας, τὰ ἐν δοξολογίᾳ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὅθεν δε ἂν εὐρῶσιν ἑαυτοῖς προσπορίζονται πρὸς βλάβην φεῦ καὶ διανοεῖσθαι, μάλιστα τῆς γραφῆς μὴ λεγουσῆς. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ἀπεδίδαμεν αὐτὴν τὴν ἀληθειαν καὶ οὐδὲν διενουμέθα· μὴ γὰρ ὁ γάμος ἀέμενος μὴ βεβηλὸς ἢ κοιτῇ μὴ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ κοιτὴ ἀμικτός; [Heb. xiii. 4.] Adv. hæ. 78. Antidic. §§ 15, 16. Tom. i. p. 1047.

² Before we pass from the testimony of Epiphanius, I would direct the attention of the reader to a remarkable passage in this part of his book (as connected with the controversy with the Romanists) against a sect small at that time, that offered sacrifice to the Virgin, and paid her divine honours. “In them,” says Epiphanius, “is that fulfilled, Some shall depart from sound

Moreover, that Jerome's belief of this doctrine was founded not upon tradition but upon Scripture is evident, for in the beginning of his Treatise against Helvidius, he says, "The very words of the Scriptures are to be adduced; he must be refuted by the very testimonies he has used against us."¹ And towards the end he says, "But as we do not deny these things which are written, so we reject those things which are *not written*. We believe that God was born of a Virgin, because we read it; that Mary married after the birth, we believe not, *because we read it not*."²

If, then, according to the Romanists and our opponents, this doctrine relies only on "tradition," we reply with Jerome, We believe it not, i. e. do not make it a point to be believed, because we read it not.

And here it is worth observing how the ground for belief in this doctrine has been shifted. The Fathers who defend it, place it upon the testimony of Scripture, and arguments drawn from the proprieties of the case. Our opponents, with the Romanists, seeing that nothing of the kind can be proved from Scripture, fall back upon "tradition," and quote the testimony of these very Fathers

doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of devils; [1 Tim. iv. 1.] for they shall be, saith he, [i. e. doubtless the Apostle] *worshippers of the dead*, as they [i. e. the dead] were worshipped by the Israelites; and *the glory that resulted to God from the saints in their time hath become to others who see not the truth an occasion of error*," (πληρουνται γαρ και επι τουτοις το, αποστησονται τινες της υγιους διδασκαλιας, προσεχοντες μυθοις και διδασκαλιας δαιμωνιων εσονται γαρ, φησι, νεκροις λατρευοντες, ως και εν τω Ισραηλ εσεβασθησαν. και η των αγιων κατα καιρον εις Θεον δοξα αλλοις γεγονε τοις μη ορωσι την αληθειαν εις πλानην.) Epiphan. ib. § 23. p. 1055. I am quite aware of the nice distinctions drawn by the Romanists on this subject, and how they defend themselves, but this is not the place to discuss them. I shall only say, Let those who like be deceived by them.

¹ Ipsa Scripturarum verba ponenda sunt; ipsis quibus adversum nos usus est testimoniis revincatur. Hieron. adv. Helvid. § 2. tom. ii. col. 206. See also Gennad. De vir. illustr. c. 32.

² Sed ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus. Natum Deum esse de Virgine credimus, quia legimus; Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus, quia non legimus. Id. ib. § 19. col. 226, 227.

who appeal to Scripture for the proof of it, as evidence of its being a doctrine established by an uninterrupted tradition of the Church!

Mr. Newman tells us that several of our divines have held the doctrine. Perhaps so; but there are others who have not, as, for instance, Bishop Stillingfleet, as we have just seen. I believe it to be a point in which many, feeling its utter insignificance, have been disposed rather at once to acquiesce than search out the evidence for it, and make it a matter of discussion. Besides, it must stand upon the evidence that can be brought for it, and not upon names. Our learned Bishop Taylor tells us that "the *universal* practice and doctrine of the Church of God in *all* ages and in *all* Churches primitive, is infinitely evident and notorious," for "the observation of *the Lord's day* solemnly once a year, i. e. the feast of Easter."¹ Are we consequently obliged to believe this, contrary to the evidence we have of the learned prelate's mistake as to the day on which the feast was observed?

We shall perhaps be told that Councils have determined this point. I reply that this is the very best proof that could be given, though far from being the only one, that Councils have not always determined things by the consentient testimony of preceding ages, but according to their private views, or the views of the majority of the age in the matter. And whatever weight it may be expedient and right to give to a Council in a point affecting the rites and ceremonies of the Church, the *utmost* that can be demanded for it in any point of belief not in Scripture is silence. It has no power to require belief in its dicta, except such as are founded upon direct Scripture authority, especially in a matter in which those who lived at an earlier period were evidently divided in opinion.

True it is, as we have admitted, that the name *heretic* has been applied by some of the Fathers, as Epiphanius

¹ See the quotation from him in Keble's Serm. App. p. 70.

and Augustine,¹ to those who held the opposite of the doctrine in question.

But are we, therefore, bound to rank all such as heretics, or to make this doctrine an article of faith or religion? On the same ground, then, we must go a step further, and maintain as a matter of religious belief that even the birth of our Saviour left Mary as much a virgin in structure as before, for Augustine expressly speaks of this as a point of Catholic belief,² and ranks Jovinian among the heretics for denying it.³ And there can be no doubt that, *strictly speaking*, this is a necessary part of the doctrine of her perpetual virginity,⁴ though not perhaps always included in it by those who profess to support it.

And this point affords us so curious and useful an example of the way in which such matters gradually advanced, until at last, being vouched for by some men of great name as part of the creed of "the Church," they took their place as important dogmas, which it was *heresy* to call in question, that we will endeavour briefly to trace its progress.

The testimony of Tertullian⁵ is, as before, clearly opposed

¹ See Epiphan. as already quoted, and August. adv. hæres. hæres. 84. Helvid. Op. tom. viii. col. 24. The work "De eccles. dogmatibus," sometimes quoted on this subject, is not his, but probably, as the Benedictines think, Gennadius's.

² Maria virgo ante conceptum, virgo post partum Cur qui potuit per clausa ostia magnus intrare non potuit etiam per incorrupta membra parvus exire? Sed neque hoc neque illud volunt credere increduli. Ideo potius fides utrumque credit Si fides Deum natum credit in carne, Deo non dubitat utrumque possibile; ut et corpus majoris ætatis non reserato aditu domus intus positus præsentaret, et sponsus infans de thalamo suo, hoc est utero virginali, illæsa matris virginitate procederet. Serm. 191. In Nat. Dom. 8. tom. v. col. 894. See also Serm. 186, ib. col. 884.

³ Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam. Lib. de hæres. c. 82. tom. viii. col. 24. And see De Nupt. et Concup. lib. ii. c. 5. tom. x. col. 308, 9; and Cont. Julian. Pelag. lib. i. c. 2. tom. x. col. 499.

⁴ Ut ἀειπαρθένος et esset et diceretur, necesse fuit virgo ut conciperet, virgo ut pareret, virgo ut semper permaneret. Montacut. Appar. 9. § 59.

⁵ Virgo quantum a viro, non virgo quantum a partu . . . si virgo concepit, in partu suo nupsit, ipsa patefacti corporis lege . . . Quis proprie vulvam adaperuit quam qui clausam patefecit? cæterum [cæteris?] omnibus nuptiæ

to the notion. His words are too clear to be explained away.

Next, comes Clement of Alexandria, who tells us that "most (οἱ πολλοί) even to that time, as it appeared, thought that Mary was a woman such as women are after child-bearing on account of the birth of her son, though she was not such; for *some* said that, being inspected by a midwife after she had brought forth, she was found a virgin."¹ It is said by Petavius that this is derived from a story given in the apocryphal book called the *Protevan-gelium* of James, and he regrets that Clement should have given it any countenance.² If it was so, it is not merely an apocryphal dream, but altogether a mistake in Clement, for the story in the apocryphal book mentioned is merely that the midwife called in by Joseph at her delivery found her a virgin *before* the birth.³

From this passage of Clement, then, it clearly appears that the notion then *prevalent* on the subject was entirely *opposed* to the doctrine in question.

Proceed we to Origen. From his words which we have placed in a note below,⁴ it is clear that he had not embraced the doctrine in question.

Nay, we may come down so low as the time of Epipha-

patefaciunt. Itaque magis patefacta est quia magis erat clausa . . . Et quid ultra de hoc retractandum est, cum hac ratione Apostolus non ex virgine sed ex muliere editum filium Dei pronuntiavit : agnovit adapertæ vulvæ nuptialem passionem. De carne Christi, c. 23. p. 324. See also the same treatise, cc. 4 and 20, and Adv. Marc. lib. iii. c. 11. lib. iv. c. 21. and lib. 5. c. 19.

¹ Αλλ', ὥς εοικεν, τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μέχρι νυν δοκεῖ ἡ Μαριαμ λέχω εἶναι διὰ τὴν τὸν παιδίου γενήσιν, οὐκ οὕσα λέχω· καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσαν, φασὶ τινες παρθενὸν εὐρεθῆναι. Strom. lib. vii. pp. 889, 890. ed. Potter.

² Petav. De incarn. l. 14. c. 6. § 1.

³ See Protevangel. Jacobi, §§ 19, 20. in Fabricii Cod. Apocr. N. T. vol. i. pp. 107 &s.

⁴ Quemcunque de utero effusum marem dixeris, non sic aperit vulvam matris suæ ut Dominus Jesus : quia omnium mulierum non partus infantis sed viri coitus vulvam reserat. Matris vero Domini eo tempore vulva reserata est, quo et partus editus, quia sanctum uterum et omni dignatione venerationis venerandum ante nativitatem Christi masculus omnino non tetigit. ORIG. In Luc. hom. 14. Op. Vol. iii. p. 948.

nus, and find that it was not yet made a doctrine of the Church, for Epiphanius is against it.¹

But proceeding a little lower, we all at once find the denial of it manufactured into a *heresy*, and hear Ambrose² and Augustine³ positively pronouncing it a part of the faith of the Church, and denouncing those who did not receive it as heretics, for this was the principal charge against Jovinian and his followers.

But here, as in the former case, the attempt is made to defend the doctrine by Scripture, and by arguments the feebleness of which is evidently acknowledged by those who tell us that it is only from "tradition" that we can obtain it.

In the next century, however, it is fully installed by Gennadius among "the doctrines of the Church," and as one about which not a doubt is to be admitted, and which it is "*blasphemy*" to call in question.⁴

¹ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΑΛΗΘΩΣ ΑΝΟΙΓΩΝ ΜΗΤΡΑΝ ΜΗΤΡΟΣ. ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΓΑΡ ΔΟΣΙ ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗΣΑΝ ΠΡΩΤΟΤΟΚΟΙ, ΙΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΣΕΜΝΟΤΕΡΟΝ ΕΙΠΩΜΕΝ, ΟΥΚ ΗΔΥΝΗΘΗΣΑΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΛΗΡΟΥΝ, ΑΛΛ' Η ΜΟΝΟΣ Δ ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΗΤΡΑΝ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΝ ΑΝΟΙΞΑΣ, ΕΝ ΤΟΥΤΩ ΓΑΡ ΜΟΝΩ ΤΕΤΕΛΕΙΩΤΑΙ, ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΑΛΛΩ ΟΥΔΕΝΙ. Adv. hæ. hæ. 78. Antidic. § 19. tom. i. p. 1051. Others have quoted Ambrose, Jerome, Athanasius, Basil, and others, as having taken the same view, from their having spoken of Christ as having opened his mother's womb, according to Luke ii. 23, but though *we* may possibly regard the passage in Luke in that light, it is very possible that these Fathers might (according to the explanation given by Thomas Aquinas, Summ. Theol. P. 3. q. 28. a. 2.) only use the words with reference to his proceeding from the womb; and I am the rather inclined to think this to be the case, because Ambrose, who speaks thus, is, as we shall see, clearly opposed to the idea of the virginity of Mary having at all suffered in parturition.

² See his Letter to Pope Symiacus, Epist. 42. ed. Bened. al. Ep. 7. Thus also he speaks elsewhere;—"Porta igitur Maria, per quam Christus intravit in hunc mundum, quando virginali fusus est partu, et genitalia virginitatis claustra non solvit. Mansit intemeratum septum pudoris, et inviolata integritatis duravere signacula cum exiret ex Virgine. AMBROS. De instit. virg. c. 8. ed. Ben.

³ See p. 211 above.

⁴ Integra fide credendum est, beatam Mariam Dei Christi matrem et virginem concepisse, et virginem genuisse, et post partum virginem permansisse. Nec est blasphemie Helvidii adquiescendum, qui dixit, Virgo ante partum, non virgo post partum. GENNAD. De eccles. dogmat. c. 36. Inter Op. Augustini. Tom. viii. App. col. 79.

And to give the reader another specimen of Gennadius's "doctrines of the Church," we may add, that the doctrine which next precedes this in his list is as follows ;— "To equal the married state with virginity vowed to God, or to believe that no merit accrues to those who abstain from wine or flesh for the sake of mortifying the body, this is not the characteristic of a Christian, but of Jovinian."¹

Thus, between the times of Clement of Alexandria and Augustine, there was a complete revolution in opinion respecting this matter, for at the former period no one dreamed of making it a point of importance, and the majority did not receive it, while at the latter it was *heresy* to doubt it. Woe to the "*blasphemer*" who presumed not to believe it.

Alas! that they whose great names had such influence in the Church, instead of adding fuel to the fire of such an unprofitable controversy, imitating their opponents in making their own private views points of faith, should not rather have silenced it altogether, as a vain and idle dispute about a matter with which religion had no concern. Yes, may we not regret with Epiphanius, that men should "turn aside from necessary points, those that concern the truth of the faith, and those that tend to the glory of God, to heap to themselves things that tend to their hurt, from wherever they can find them." "Alas," we say with him, "that the matter should be agitated, particularly when the Scripture [as our opponents admit] does not speak of it. For if the Scripture had mentioned it, we should have embraced the truth without hesitation;" but we add, in the words of Jerome, "we make it not a point of belief, because we *read it not*."

The reader may, I fear, think that we have dwelt upon this matter too long. But as our opponents have put it forward as a point of importance, and as it is one re-

¹ *Sacratæ Deo virginitati nuptias cœquare, aut pro amore castigandi corporis abstinētibz a vino vel carnibz nihil credere meriti accrescere, nec hoc Christiani sed Joviniani est.* Id. ib. c. 35.

markably illustrative of our subject, we were desirous of placing its history clearly before him, heartily as we could have wished, for the honour of the Church of Christ, that such a matter had never been the subject of discussion among her members.

Before I conclude this chapter, there are two objections, often urged by the Romanists, which I will anticipate.

It is said (as we have already remarked ¹) that, according to our system, our rule of faith is not the same as that of the primitive Christians, for that they must have had information from the Apostles which we, by discarding "tradition," are rejecting.

I reply, that in one sense our rule of faith is the same, viz. the whole of that which we have good reason for acknowledging as divine revelation; and that in the sense in which it is not the same, namely, in actual extent, *that of our opponents is also not the same*; for, to give an example, St. Paul tells the Thessalonians, that he had informed them what it was that withheld the appearance of the man of sin, but the Romanists themselves will not pretend to say that Church tradition has delivered this down to us. And there are many other things about which we are equally in the dark, respecting which, nevertheless, we can have little doubt that the first Christians received some information from the Apostles.

And a similar answer holds good with respect to another objection.

It is sometimes said that Scripture cannot be the entire rule of faith, because some inspired books have perished.

To this, indeed, we reply, first, that we deny the fact, and challenge those who maintain it to give any proof that any books ever held to be *part of the canon of Scripture* have perished.²

¹ See vol. i. p. 533.

² This is an objection of Bellarmine, to whose remarks we may find a reply in one of his own communion, viz. Stapleton. See his *De Princip. lib. ix. c. 5*; and *De auct. Script. adv. Whitak. lib. ii. c. 1. § 7*.

But even if it were so, this does not alter the state of the case. It does not prove that patristical tradition is a divine informant, or infallible record of Apostolical teaching. It in fact leaves us precisely where it found us; even in possession of that Divine record of revealed truth which God has seen fit in his infinite mercy to preserve to us.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SUFFICIENCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE TO TEACH MANKIND THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

AMONG the various objections brought against the views for which we here contend, it is urged that Scripture is too *obscure* to be able to sustain the character we attribute to it; for that, even in the fundamental points of faith and practice, it needs an interpreter to point out its meaning, and that in "tradition" we have such an interpreter, and one "practically infallible," demanding our faith as a witness of the oral teaching of the Apostles.¹

Now that we have not in tradition any certain witness of the oral teaching of the Apostles, nor (in whatever light it be viewed) a divine or practically infallible interpreter of Scripture, has been, I hope, already proved; and consequently it follows, (as far as our opponents' views are concerned,) that Holy Scripture is our only divine and infallible Teacher. Whatever obscurity, then, there may be in the revelation there made to us of the Christian religion, it is the only revelation of it we possess. Whatever difficulties or obscurities may have been left by God in the Scriptures, there is no authoritative interpretation of them demanding our belief. He who is plain beyond that which is written, goes beyond his authority, i. e. beyond that for which divine inspiration can be *claimed*.

Hence, Scripture being our only inspired Teacher, and

¹ See vol. i. p. 38.

containing all which has any claim upon our belief as a divine revelation, it seems but *reasonable* to conclude that nothing can be a fundamental point of faith or practice which is not *plainly* revealed therein. For if Scripture is our sole divine informant, and was written for the instruction of men generally, it seems far from consistent with the gift of such a rule of faith that it should be so obscure in the very fundamental points as to oblige us to depend upon human teachers to know what it means. And if, through carelessness, indifference, prejudice, or any other cause, men remain blind to what is there plainly delivered, such perverseness is easily accounted for, and forms no ground for accusing the word of God of obscurity.

On this argument, however, I shall not dwell further, because it is my purpose to proceed at once to more direct evidence of the sufficiency of Scripture to teach the faith, independently of what has preceded this chapter.

In so doing, I shall first offer a few preliminary observations, to guard against misconception, and show what it is for which we here contend, and then proceed to prove the three following points.

I. That all the *fundamental* and *essential* points of faith and practice are clearly and plainly delivered in the Scriptures.

II. That *all* the doctrines of the Christian faith are *as* plainly delivered there as, *to our knowledge*, they are *revealed*.

III. That the best and only infallible expositor of Scripture is Scripture.

To guard against misconception, I shall offer, in the first place, a few preliminary observations, to make it more clear to the reader what it is for which we contend.

And here I would observe first, that when we speak of all the essential doctrines of Christianity being clearly revealed to us in the Scriptures, we are not affirming that the truths themselves so revealed are cleared from all mysteriousness, and made obvious to the understand-

ings of men, for many of them are, and ever will be, to our finite understandings, mysterious and obscure; but, that they are plainly, openly, and undeniably delivered there, that is, that the sacred writers have delivered, in the plainest terms, the revelations of divine truth vouchsafed to them, and consequently, that all which God purposed to reveal to the world by them is so expressed, that not even the Apostles themselves could declare it more clearly.

I would instance this in the very case to which our opponents, following the Romanists, point us as supplying an argument in their favour, viz. the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. Not to insist here upon a point which will come under consideration more properly elsewhere, viz. that the Nicene Fathers deduced this doctrine altogether from Scripture, I would ask whether this doctrine is not much *more plainly* delivered in Scripture than in that document to which our opponents refer us for it, viz. the Nicene Creed. The expression there used, though perhaps the best that could be found, so imperfectly expresses the doctrine, as to have been absolutely rejected by the orthodox at the Council of Antioch, against Paul of Samosata, as an unorthodox phrase; and it is evidently open to an unorthodox interpretation, which Scripture, *taken as a whole, and compared with itself*, is not. It is an orthodox term, rightly understood; convenient it may be for a compendious statement of the truth in a confession of faith; but it is not equivalent to the exposition of the doctrine contained in Scripture. The true doctrine is not so clearly, plainly, and unambiguously expressed by it as it is in Scripture, taken as a whole.

We do not then here deny, but, on the contrary, affirm, that many of the truths delivered in the Scriptures are mysterious and obscure, and beyond the power of man fully to comprehend; and this is the great reason why, with minds naturally disinclined to them, men are unwilling to receive them as they are revealed, however plainly revealed.

Nor do we deny that there are many points among non-essentials, not so plainly delivered, but that men may reasonably be divided in opinion as to the precise doctrine delivered; and such points, perhaps, were not intended to be made known to all.

Nor further do we deny that some particular passages may be very obscure.

But all such obscurity is quite consistent with that for which we are here contending. Nay, it has been said, not without reason, by some, that God has purposely ordered it thus, that while the fundamentals of the faith should be so clear that no sincere and earnest enquirer could mistake in them, there should also be what might serve to exercise the industry and mental powers of man, and carry out his mind to the contemplation of spiritual and heavenly objects.

Moreover, we are not here asserting that it is sufficient to put the Scriptures into the hands of children and men wholly illiterate, and leave them to deduce the faith from them, any more than it would be sufficient to put the statutes of the realm, however plainly expressed they might be, into their hands, and tell them to deduce from them a digest of the statute law. But this arises not from the obscurity of one or the other; nor does it show the necessity of an infallible interpreter, but only the need of *literary* assistance to inform such of the meaning of the expressions used, and point out to them what, through the imperfect development of their faculties, they might have misunderstood or passed unnoticed. It is not tradition which they want, but a knowledge of the meaning of the words used in Scripture. And such deficiency of information on their part, cannot be justly urged in proof of Scripture being obscure; and still less of the necessity of tradition or the Church, *as the Church*, to explain it. And the truth is, that so far as the mind is able to receive the faith, it needs but little education to enable a man to learn from Scripture the fundamentals of the faith.

Further, when we contend for the sufficiency of Scrip-

ture to teach the faith, we must be understood as speaking only with reference to the humble-minded and unprejudiced student of Scripture. To the proud and self-sufficient reasoner, to him who comes with all the prejudices of the natural mind clouding his perceptions, or with some preconceived views, *derived from whatever source*, to *confirm*, the declarations of Scripture may be anything but plain. But they may be obscure to such, merely because the mind is unwilling to receive them in their obvious meaning; and they may, consequently, have divers meanings given to them, merely because the prejudices of their readers are of divers kinds. We have heard of the Scriptures being quoted in support of sedition, rebellion, immorality. Are we to suppose that they are obscure on these points? that it is *doubtful* whether they discountenance such practices or not? If men go to the Scriptures with minds in any way prejudiced, and not simply to be taught the truth, but only to confirm their own preconceived notions, derived from other sources, as our opponents openly profess and exhort others to do, they will, no doubt, find Scripture sufficiently obscure. A person going to the Scriptures to *confirm* some preconceived notions about justification, gathered from what he calls "tradition," may find many passages very difficult to deal with. For if a man has made up his mind that two and two make five, a plain declaration that two and two make four, is the most difficult passage he could have to deal with.

And if it be said that "tradition" is necessary, on account of the prejudices of men casting a veil over the meaning of Scripture, as Mr. Newman has strangely enough argued, then I would ask whether the same prejudices will not distort the testimony of "tradition" in the same way? For if the ground for the supposed obscurity of Scripture be in the unwillingness of the mind to embrace the truth, then the same reason will cause tradition also to appear obscure. And this is borne out by the testimony of facts; for, as we have already seen, there has

hardly been a heresy in the Church in any age, but that the Fathers have been quoted in defence of it; and Mr. Newman himself¹ (as we have seen²) admits, that, with prejudiced minds, antiquity “admits of easy evasion, and may be made to conclude anything or nothing;” thereby answering his own argument. And when we recollect in how great a variety of expression that tradition appears, and the imperfection of its mode of conveyance, surely the prejudices of man are still more likely to lead him astray in such a wide field of enquiry as the wilderness of the Fathers, than in the well-ordered garden of God’s Holy Scriptures.

The truth is, that there is but one way in which such prejudices can be removed; and that is, by the operations of the Holy Spirit upon men, enlightening the mind, so as to enable it to perceive the truth; and influencing the heart to receive it in the love of it. As long as the mind is blinded, and the heart hardened by sin and Satan, the truths of God’s word, however clear, are in vain clear, as far as such a one is concerned. The light shines upon blindness, and the blind comprehends it not. He gropes in the noonday, as at night.

Lastly, we do not deny that there are different degrees of light and knowledge enjoyed by different individuals; and that a good use of the helps we have for the understanding of Scripture, may and will, with God’s blessing, increase our insight into the plain truths of Scripture. There is a depth in them which will reward the most diligent search; and while Scripture is the best interpreter of itself, the labours of others in search of truth may here, as in other cases, *shorten* ours. But this does not affect our position, which is, That Holy Scripture is amply sufficient *in itself* to every diligent and humble-minded student of it, to teach all the fundamentals of faith and practice; and consequently to refute all heretical notions respecting them.

“*That the Holy Scripture,*” says a Bishop of our Church, cited by Bishop Gibson, in his *Preservative*

¹ Lect. p. 68.

² See vol. i. pp. 607, 8.

against Popery, "is so plain in all things necessary to salvation, that it may be rightly understood or interpreted, by any man of sound judgment, is a proposition which *one would imagine should not be questioned by any Christian* If the Scripture be sufficient to bring every man to eternal happiness, then every man may understand it, so far as it is necessary for the attainment of that end. OF THIS THERE IS NO CONTROVERSY AMONG PROTESTANTS."¹

I now pass on to the consideration of the three points I have mentioned above.

I. That all the fundamental and essential points of faith and practice are clearly and plainly delivered in the Scriptures; and consequently that the Scriptures are well adapted and amply sufficient to *teach* men all such points.

I am well aware that some ingenious controversialists, when hard pressed by the arguments of their opponents, have maintained *in words* the former of these two propositions, while denying the truth of the latter, meaning, as they explain themselves, that such truths are clearly and plainly delivered in the Scriptures *to those who know them before*; just (we may add) as the meaning of any mysterious heathen orgies is clear and plain to those to whom the priest has communicated the key; but notwithstanding this, I must venture to think that the latter of these two propositions is the necessary consequence of the former; and that to adopt the former *in words*, and deny the latter, is but self-contradiction or equivocation. For if the truth is plain in Scripture, after "tradition" has pointed it out, was it not plain there before? The testimony of tradition may make a man more ready to receive it; but it cannot affect the degree of plainness with which it is delivered in the Scriptures. No doubt, if a man has made up his mind that Scripture must mean whatever such and such interpreters of Scripture say that it means,

¹ The Protestant and Popish way of interpreting Scripture impartially compared, in answer to Pax vobis, 1689. 4to. pp. 34, 35. This is sometimes attributed to Archbishop Tenison; but, by Bishop Gibson, to Dr. Grove, Bishop of Chichester.

he is in the mood to think that Scripture plainly has that meaning. But with others the case is different.

Now the truth of what we here affirm depends, principally, upon the *style* in which the Scriptures are written; i. e. whether they deliver the truths which are intended for the instruction of mankind at large, under the veil of an obscure phraseology, or so as to be generally understood; for it is *not denied* that the Scriptures *contain* all the fundamental and essential doctrines of Christianity. We maintain, then, that what was intended to be understood by all, is expressed in the Scriptures so as to be understood by all. The divine revelation vouchsafed to mankind, is conveyed to us in the Scriptures as clearly and plainly, as far as that revelation goes, as human language will permit.

This aptitude of Scripture to teach the doctrines of religion appears,

First, from the testimony of Scripture.

“Whatsoever things,” saith the Apostle, “were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we, through patience and *comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope.*” (Rom. xv. 4.) Here we are taught what is the great object for which the Scriptures were written, and the purpose they answer to the Christian. True; this applies only to the Old Testament Scriptures; but if such was their object, such the end they answered, then certainly the plainer records of the New Testament are much better calculated to answer the same purpose. Are we, then, to suppose that the whole of the New Testament united with the Old, is insufficient to make us acquainted with the essentials of the Christian religion? The point to which I particularly desire the attention of the reader in this passage is, that the Scriptures themselves, not any exposition of them, not any ecclesiastical teaching of any kind, are here referred to as the source of comfort and hope to the Christian; the teacher, from whose instructions he derives his hopes; while, on the contrary, our opponents tell us that it is only the teaching of “the Church” that can make us wise unto salvation.

Still stronger evidence in our favour is to be found in our Lord's exhortation to the Jews, "*Search the Scriptures . . . they are they which testify of me.*" (John v. 39.) It is undeniable that these words were addressed to the people generally; and they are here exhorted to examine for themselves the evidence afforded by the Old Testament Scriptures to our Lord's character and mission, as evidence amply sufficient to guide them to a knowledge of the truth. From which we may observe two things,—both that the Scriptures are written so as to teach mankind in general, and also that unbelief and ignorance of the truths they reveal, and a perversion of their meaning, may arise from a very different cause to their being unintelligible without an interpreter. It is evident that our Lord only considered it to be necessary that the Scriptures should be "*searched*," should be diligently read and investigated, in order to their reception of him in his true character as the Saviour of mankind; while at the same time we find that the great majority of those who professed a familiar acquaintance with those Scriptures, perverted their meaning, and would not receive them in their true sense. And, let me ask, which to all appearance, at that time, was the sense affixed to those Scriptures by "the Church?" What follower of "the Church," as his interpreter of Scripture, would have come to the conclusion that he was to leave the whole body of scribes and pharisees to follow Simeon and Anna? No; it was only the humble student of "the Scriptures," under the guidance of that Holy Spirit who is ever present to the prayer of the faithful, who was likely to arrive at a knowledge of the truth.

It is no reply to say, that this argument proves too much, for that it would prove that the Old Testament Scriptures are sufficient without the New. It proves only that the Old Testament Scriptures expressed with sufficient plainness the truths they did reveal, to be understood by all who studied them; and this is all for which we adduce it; except to remark that we have here the

highest sanction, whoever we be, to our placing the written word infinitely above every other guide, and walking according to what shall appear to us, after a diligent investigation, to be its true meaning.

I will cite but one passage more, which shall be the remarkable testimony of St. Paul to the value of the Old Testament Scriptures, in his Second Epistle to Timothy. "From a child," he says, "thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, *which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus*. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 15—17.) Is it possible that any man, with this passage before him, will venture to say that the Scriptures are not calculated, and were not intended, to *teach* mankind in general; but are written so as that they need an interpreter before they can be understood? I do not here quote this passage, be it observed, as showing *how much*, whether more or less, is contained in the Scriptures, because it refers to the Scriptures of the Old Testament; but I refer to it, as showing the *purposes* of Scripture, "all Scripture," that it was intended to make the man of God perfect, and thoroughly to furnish him to all good works; in other words, to be, what our opponents deny that it was intended to be, his great *teacher* and instructor.

And hence, if Scripture *contains* all the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion, all those truths which were intended to be understood by all, then it follows, from the mode of writing adopted by the sacred penmen, that all those truths are delivered as clearly and plainly as they are intended to be understood.

Against this line of argument is sometimes urged the case of the Ethiopian eunuch,—who, when reading the prophet Isaiah, and being questioned by Philip whether he understood what he read, replied, "How can I, except some man should teach me;"—but to no purpose.

For we do not assert that the truths of Christianity can be learnt from the Old Testament Scriptures alone. It is sufficient for our purpose that those Scriptures were a sufficiently clear revelation of what was necessary truth to those who lived under them. This is all which we assert or want for our argument. That they were written in a phraseology calculated to veil the truth to a certain extent before our Lord's appearance, is perfectly true. But I would ask, Was the Church able to remove that veil? Did it see through that veil when our Lord appeared in strict accordance with the declarations of those Scriptures, yea in such strict accordance, that he sent the people to those Scriptures to learn from them the truth which "the Church" was denying? The phraseology, then, was as plain as the revelation was intended to be, and this is all for which we contend for any part of Scripture. But thus much we maintain in behalf of all Scripture.

The same remarks apply to another passage sometimes objected to us, viz. Luke xxiv. 45. "Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures." The Scriptures here referred to are, as it appears by the context, those relating to Christ; and there was a degree of obscurity in the declarations of the Old Testament respecting the incarnation and sufferings of Christ which the event only could clear up. Our Lord, therefore, might well explain to his disciples the precise way in which they were to be accomplished, and show them how accurately they had been fulfilled in himself. And what our Lord did was to "open their understandings," which were blinded by prejudice and unbelief, that they might receive that which, in the prophecy connected with the accomplishment, was plainly set before them. In a word, he removed the prejudices by which "their minds were blinded," and the "veil" which was "upon their hearts." (2 Cor. iii. 14, 15.) And, in the writings of the Apostles, our Lord has given us similar explanations, and will by his Spirit open in like manner the un-

derstandings of all sincere and penitent inquirers after the way of salvation, and remove the blindness and prejudices of the natural mind, and enable it to understand and receive those truths which are thus so plainly set before it.

We are also met sometimes by the observation of St. Peter, that in the Epistles of St. Paul there are some things hard to be understood. (2 Pet. iii. 16.) But do we deny that such is the case? Far from it. But we say that such things were *intended* by the Holy Spirit to be "hard to be understood," and that we must seek the meaning of them from that Holy Spirit himself; and with respect to them call no man or set of men master, i. e. *authoritative* teacher, upon earth.

And lastly, the passage is sometimes urged, in which St. Peter tells us that "no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation," (2 Pet. i. 20;) but most incorrectly, for the context shows that the meaning is, that no prophecy of the Scripture proceeds from any private interpretation or declaration of God's will, for it is added, "for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And so the Vulgate translates the passage, "The prophecy of Scripture is not made by private interpretation," (*propria interpretatione non fit*;) and Menochius, in his comment on the passage, allows that this is its meaning; and so does Cornelius a Lapide, though he attempts also to extract the other meaning from it, to make it support the Romish cause.

This suitability of Scripture to teach the Christian religion may be inferred,

Secondly, From the professed object of the sacred writers of the New Testament, which was to teach all the great truths of the Gospel, without concealment or reserve.

This is fully proved by many passages of their writings. St. Luke wrote his Gospel in order, in the first instance,

that Theophilus might “know the certainty of those things in which he had been instructed.” (Luke i. 4.)

And St. Paul, when speaking of himself as a minister of the New Testament, says, “Seeing, then, that we have such hope, we use *great plainness of speech*, and not as Moses, who put a veil over his face,” &c. (2 Cor. iii. 12.) And again, a little further on, he says,—“By *manifestation* of the truth commending ourselves to *every man’s conscience* in the sight of God,” (2 Cor. iv. 2.) a testimony remarkably forcible in proof of our position, that the Apostle always delivered the truths with which he was entrusted as clearly as language would permit, and so as to commend the instructor to *every man’s conscience*, and thus teach *every man* the truth in the most forcible manner, and therefore certainly so expressed himself, when delivering those truths in his Epistles to the Churches. And he exhorts the brethren to pray for him, that “utterance might be given unto him, that he might open his mouth *boldly*, to *make known* the mystery of the gospel.” (Eph. vi. 19.)

If, then, the writings of this Apostle and his brethren contain all the essential truths of the gospel, (as it is admitted they do,) surely men who felt thus would take care that in such documents more especially those truths should be *clearly and fully* expressed, to say nothing of that spiritual guidance under which those documents were penned.

It is impossible not to see how totally opposed such statements as those we have referred to are to the views of the Romanists and the Tractators, whose representations would lead us to suppose that the Bible is a sort of cabalistical book, the knowledge of whose meaning is confined to a certain order of men, ordained by succession from the Apostles. Such a notion, however, is suitable only to the priests of superstition and idolatry. Would that we might live to see the day when such doctrines were left in their sole possession! To them they

are suitable enough, for false religion dreads the light, and hence their so called sacred books are most consistently veiled in the language of concealment and mystery. But it is not so with the word of God. All that God sees fit to reveal is, as far as it was intended to be known, stated clearly and plainly on all occasions by those whom he uses as instruments to deliver his word. And therefore certainly the fundamentals of religion are never obscurely stated in any Divine declaration respecting them.

The sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to teach the Christian religion to mankind generally, may be inferred,

Thirdly, From the persons to whom the writings of the Apostles are addressed.

These writings, with but few exceptions, are not addressed to the pastors of the Church in particular. The Gospels were written for the instruction of Christians generally; and, in fact, of mankind at large; and were written in order to give them a full knowledge of the Christian faith. The Epistles are most of them expressly directed to *all* the individuals of the body of Christians to whom they are addressed. The Epistle to the Romans is addressed to "*all that are in Rome called to be saints.*" (Rom. i. 7.) And the First to the Corinthians is addressed to "*the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord both theirs and ours;*" (1 Cor. i. 2;) and to these persons the Apostle uses this language, "*I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say;*" (1 Cor. x. 15;) "*Judge in yourselves, is it comely, &c.*" (1 Cor. xi. 13.)¹ And the Apostles were anxious that their writings should be read by all; for St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, exhorts them to take care that his Epistle be "*read to all the holy brethren,*" (1 Thess. v. 27,) and commands the Colossians to cause his Epistle to them to be read also in the

¹ See also 1 Thess. v. 27. Phil. i. 1. &c.

Church of the Laodiceans; and that they should read the Epistle from Laodicea. (Col. iv. 16.)

Hence they are written so that *all* may learn the truths of which they speak, from them. They are written in a style adapted to the instruction of every, even the humblest, member of society. They address each individual as one who is responsible to God for receiving and obeying that which they have thus delivered.

True, the persons so addressed had some previous knowledge of the truths of Christianity; but this, in no respect, diminishes the force of the argument. For if any truths were passed over on this account, they would only be the most plain and simple; but these, it is conceded, are contained in Scripture. And in whatever matters the persons so addressed needed instruction, they needed it in the most plain and clear form, brought down to the comprehension of mankind in general. So that, in whatever point instruction is given by the Apostles, it seems evident, from the way in which they address themselves to all mankind, that such instruction must be given in the plainest and clearest form. If a man was addressing a miscellaneous body of professing Christians, including the humblest of mankind, and instructing them in the faith, he would use language suited to teach the faith, as far as it went, to all mankind. Just so was it with the Apostles. They had, for the most part, simple and ignorant men to deal with, and they wrote so as to be understood by them.

The suitability of Scripture to teach the Christian religion, might also be inferred,

Fourthly, From the evident simplicity of the language of the New Testament.

This is a point in which our appeal lies to the common sense and observation of the reader. Can it be denied that the statements of the New Testament are couched in terms the most simple, and phrases the most perspicuous, that the subject would admit of? Can it be denied that, instead of any air of mystery or concealment being adopted

with regard to all the great fundamental articles of the faith, there is, on the contrary, every appearance of an endeavour to state them in the most plain and intelligible manner? Nay, it is admitted by our adversaries, that such is the case; but with a reservation that makes their tenet self-contradictory, viz., that they are thus plain in Scripture *only* to those who have been taught them beforehand; that is, in fact, that Scripture does not plainly deliver them to all.

I ask, then, if Scripture contains all the fundamental articles of the faith, couched in the most plain and intelligible terms, how is it that it can be insufficient to *teach* those articles?

I must add, also, that the suitability of Scripture to teach the Christian religion, may be inferred,

Fifthly, From its actual effects.

Here, again, our appeal is to experience and fact; and many, I have no doubt, will be disposed at once to deny that any argument can be deduced from this source, in favour of our position. Here, then, we are in a situation that renders it next to impossible to press the argument home upon the reader. Narratives of facts, such as those to which I am here alluding, generally carry little conviction to the mind of one prepossessed in favour of an opposite view. Such facts must be witnessed, to convince the gainsayer. But I cannot omit a reference to them here, as bearing important witness in favour of our position. It is an argument which it may not be easy to test; because the cases are comparatively few where a man has been left to gather his religious knowledge altogether from the Bible. But no man can have perused the accounts given from time to time of the proceedings of our religious societies of late years, and not have been struck with the testimonies borne to the effects produced by the Scriptures alone.

However, I shall content myself here with having directed the attention of the reader to this argument, and would only request him not to form a hasty judgment

from the effects produced by the careless and apathetic perusal given to the Scriptures by the generality, but from those produced by the earnest and sincere perusal of one who is really desirous of learning and following the truth, and is seriously asking the question, "What must I do to be saved?"

Lastly, I will not hesitate to add, fortified by the preceding evidences, that the suitability of Scripture to *teach* the Christian religion, may be inferred from the nature of its subject, compared with the revealed character of its Author.

Its subject is the way and means of man's salvation; the character of its Author, one who willeth that salvation. The very fact, then, of its being a revelation upon such a subject, from such a source, is of itself an evidence that whatever is delivered in it, so far as it was intended by God that the revelation should extend, is well calculated to impart the knowledge which it was God's purpose to give. He who charges the word of God with obscurity in such matters as were intended by him to be revealed to man, either charges its Author with incompetency, or takes away from him that character in which he delights, by representing him as putting unnecessary difficulties in the way of the salvation of man.

And this would apply, doubtless, to whatever the Apostles delivered on the subject, whether orally or by writing; but of the former, we have no satisfactory testimony what it was; and if we suppose that their teaching was uniformly thus clear and plain, the existence of the Scriptures leaves us but little cause to regret the absence of sufficient testimony as to what they did deliver orally, at least *as far as the fundamentals of faith and practice are concerned*.

These writings are not all occasional productions, written to meet particular errors, and inculcate particular points. The Gospels at least were intended to give us a full account of our Lord's teaching, and of all the great facts which form the Christian faith. And besides these,

we have more than twenty Epistles of the Apostles, giving an enlarged account of the same faith.

But all are not sufficient, we are told, to teach us the faith. And we are sent to what? To the monuments accidentally remaining to us of antiquity, the works of a few antient authors, borne up by chance upon the surface of the stream of time; while thousands have perished equally or better entitled to our respect; and these belonging only to what some might call the prevailing party among Christians, and confessedly, in part, (to what extent we know not,) corrupted and interpolated, and supposititious; and from these volumes we are to obtain the meaning of the Holy Scriptures; seeing, forsooth, that these volumes are to be taken as containing within them an infallible representation of the oral teaching of the Apostles; from which alone we can tell what they meant in their writings; or rather what the Holy Spirit meant, when he was professing to teach it in them.

It is at least evident, then, that such a rule of faith as Dr. Pusey and his party propose to us, can be made use of only by the learned. For, even were these volumes translated into all the languages spoken by Christians, I suppose it will be granted that such an investigation can only be carried on by learned men. And it would be a rather curious inquiry, by the way, how many there are even among the learned, who are really acquainted with their rule of faith, if patristical tradition forms part of it.

What, then, is the unlearned man to do? What is *he* to do? He is to learn, from his "priest," the "tradition" delivered in these volumes; and he is to put his faith in the interpretation of the Scriptures so given him, as a divine interpretation, derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles. And if, perchance, he should think the interpretation thus given him, not to be what appears to him the meaning of the Scriptures, he is to put his faith in the interpretation, and not in what appears to him to be God's truth; for such is Mr. Newman's express direction.

I pass on to observe—

II. That *all* the doctrines of the Christian faith are *as* plainly delivered in the Scriptures as, *to our knowledge*, they are *revealed*.

Assuming that the arguments adduced on our last head have been satisfactory, and that the reader is disposed to admit that all the essential and fundamental points of faith are clearly and plainly delivered in the Scriptures, we have here only to consider the case of those which are not to be classed among the fundamental points of faith.

Now here even Vincent of Lerins seems to hesitate as to making a claim to any well-authenticated report of Apostolical tradition, anything which can be looked upon as delivering to us with certainty the oral teaching of the Apostles; and our opponents themselves are somewhat self-contradictory in their statements; in some places making a claim to the possession of testimony of a certain and indubitable kind,¹ and in others apparently admitting that we cannot be altogether certain of the correctness of the testimony we possess on these points,² though this admission is accompanied with the intimation that we must “either believe or silently acquiesce in *the whole*” of what the “prophetical tradition” of the Church (as Mr. Newman calls it) delivers to us.

That on these points much valuable information is to be obtained from the writings of the antient Church, is what I am far from prepared to deny, but, on the contrary, firmly maintain.

But what I ask is, How can you in any case verify a doctrine, or interpretation, or statement, as an Apostolical tradition?

We have already shown the impossibility of doing so. We have shown that the tests proposed by our opponents are altogether fallible and nugatory. We have shown that there is no certain and indubitable report of any divine revelation but the Holy Scripture.

¹ See Newman's Lect. p. 299, and Keble's serm. pp. 36, 7.

² See Newman's Lect. pp. 249 and 300.

However obscure, therefore, any of the less fundamental doctrines or statements of Scripture may be considered to be, there is no plainer report of them than what we find there, that can come to us with any authority to bind the conscience to belief. They are *as* plainly delivered in the Scriptures as, *to our knowledge*, they are *revealed*.

I proceed to show:—

III. That the best and only infallible expositor of Scripture is Scripture; or, in other words, that the best mode of judging of the sense of any passage is by a comparison of it with the testimony of Scripture in other parts; first, by comparing it with the *context*, with passages *similarly* worded, with such *plain* places of Scripture as can illustrate its meaning, and with all that is stated in Scripture respecting the *subject* treated of; and secondly, by considering it in connexion with the whole scheme of doctrine clearly revealed in Scripture.

We take it for granted, that we have sufficiently demonstrated that patristical tradition cannot be considered a divine informant. Whatever, then, may be its value as a help to us in obtaining a knowledge of Christian doctrine, it must be placed in a very different rank to an inspired guide. It partakes of the imperfection of human nature. It is mixed with the dross of human imaginations.

Moreover, “the things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God.” It is not by any peculiar powers of mind or extent of human learning, that the mysteries of God’s word are to be developed. They can be known only *as far as they are revealed*, nor can any powers of man furnish us with a further insight into them than the Divine declarations afford us; for all beyond that is the offspring of the human imagination. Nevertheless there is, as experience shows us, a strong inclination in men to be wise above what is written; to attempt to fathom mysteries beyond their reach, and explain fully and without reserve even those more hidden spiritual truths of which

the word of God contains only some intimations, and thus bring out a system which shall be complete in all its parts; and in this attempt they are in danger at every step of being led astray by the prejudices of human nature, the bias of preconceived notions, the flights of an erratic imagination. Look at Origen, for instance, who lived at a period when, according to our opponents, the savour of Apostolical oral tradition was yet fresh in the Church. With human commentators, therefore, we must be always on our guard.

It seems obvious, then, that our first inquiry in the interpretation of Scripture should be, What has God said on this matter elsewhere in Scripture? Is there any other passage in the word of God, that either in the sentiment conveyed, or in the expressions used, is similar to the one before us? Whether the difficulty lies in the precise meaning of the terms used, or in the doctrine intended to be conveyed, there is no mode of solving the difficulty equally efficacious or satisfactory with that of putting together the parallel passages of Scripture, and judging from them *as a whole* what is the mind of God in the particular passage under consideration. For here alone we have the infallible records of divine teaching, the mind of the Spirit.

And while we compare it with the parallel passages, we must remember not to take an *insulated* view of the doctrine which it seems to inculcate, but to contemplate it *in its position* in the great scheme of Scripture doctrine, so as more clearly to see its true form and proportions, and ascertain that our notions of it are such as to give it that harmony with the whole which beyond doubt it possesses.

Such was the course pursued by the Fathers at the Council of Nice. When desirous of accurately describing the divine nature of the Son in opposition to the errors of the Arians, they, as we are told by Athanasius, "collected together out of the Scriptures these words, the brightness, the fountain, and the river, and the image of

the substance, and that expression, ‘ In thy light shall we see light,’ and that, ‘ I and my Father are one ;’ and then at last they wrote more plainly and compendiously, that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, for all the previous expressions have this meaning.”¹

This is precisely an exemplification of that for which we are here contending. The views of the Nicene Fathers were not derived (as those of the heretics were, and almost always are,) from one or two insulated passages of Scripture, still less from patristical tradition, but from a general consideration of the *whole* testimony of Scripture upon the point; and from this they deduced the faith, and interpreted each particular passage.

This, indeed, is a common rule of interpretation in other works, especially those that have come down to us from a remote period. There are often particular trains of thought, and particular modes of expression, characteristic of particular authors; and there is no mode of arriving at the sense of an author so efficient or satisfactory, as that of judging (if possible) from the collation of similar passages. This rule, then, applies with tenfold force to Scripture, for both as to the author and the subject it is a work altogether *sui generis*. It alone claims to be inspired. It alone was written at the dictation of the Holy Spirit. It alone delivers with authority divine truth.

The light, therefore, which we thus derive is altogether pure; it is divine light. The interpretation, as far as it goes, is an *inspired* interpretation. There is no uncertainty in it; no allowance to be made for human imperfection; no room for exceptions and limitations in our reception of it. We may embrace it with more confidence than we would a friend, whose love and faithfulness it was impossible to call in question; while everything else is to be received only as one towards whom we are bound to observe caution and reserve. Whatever mistakes may be made here, they are owing entirely to

¹ Athanas. ad Afr. Episc. Epist. § 6. See the passage, c. 10, below.

our own imperfection and prejudices, while with any other guide we have not only our own imperfection and prejudices to contend with, but those of our guide too.

Moreover, whatever weight may be attached by any to what the Fathers have delivered, it is allowed by all, (as we have already observed,) that as it respects the *words* Scripture only is inspired. This again very strongly tends to show that Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture. For other interpreters may make use of words very open to an unorthodox meaning, though well intended by the writer. While opposing one error, they may use words leaning to the opposite, as we have already seen to have been continually the case with the Fathers. But by a comparison of Scripture with itself, we may see the same doctrine expressed in different phrases, and illustrated by various allusions, all inspired, and therefore free from the least error, or inclination to error, if only fairly and honestly taken; and in this variety of phrase and illustration we have an inspired commentary upon the text whose meaning we are seeking.

Further, as it respects the efficiency of this mode of interpretation, we must observe, that all the great doctrines of Christianity (which are those with which we are here principally concerned) lie in a small compass, and were the great subjects of the Apostles' preaching. Having, then, four different accounts of our Lord's life and doctrine, and so many Epistles addressed on different occasions to various Churches, we have these doctrines placed before us in the New Testament in *so many various ways and different phrases*, yet all indited by the omniscient Spirit, that we have ample scope afforded us for using with success such a mode of interpretation. Not to mention that in the Old Testament also we have an adumbration of much that is of the highest moment in the Christian faith. Hence it is said by Clement of Alexandria, that the Scriptures are to be expounded according to "the ecclesiastical rule," and "the eccle-

siastical rule," he tells us, "is the consent and harmony of the Law and the Prophets with the covenant [or, testament] delivered by the advent of our Lord."¹ And any one who looks into the writings of the earliest Fathers, will see that this comparison of the statements of the two Testaments was one of their chief guides in the interpretation of Scripture.

Nay, we have some remarkable testimonies on this head in the writings of some of the Romanists themselves, when, forgetting their controversies, they gave utterance to their unbiassed judgment.

Thus Joseph a Costa, the Jesuit, says,—“Nothing appears to me to explain Scripture equally with Scripture itself. Therefore the diligent, attentive, and frequent reading and meditation, and collation of the Scriptures, always appeared to me the very best of all guides for understanding it. For passages of Scripture are best understood from each other . . . that which is clear explains that which is obscure, and that which is certain explains that which is doubtful.”² And thus speaks Salmero on the Epistles of St. Paul,—“The best rule for understanding and explaining the more obscure passages of Paul is to compare the parallel passages that treat of the same subject with one another; for one elucidates the other.”³

Let us test this method of interpreting Scripture by Scripture by an example.

Take the text, “This is my body . . . this is my blood of the New Testament.” (Matt. xxvi. 26, 28; Mark xiv. 22, 24.)

Our opponents would here send us to the Fathers,

¹ See ch. 10 below.

² *Nihil perinde Scripturam mihi videtur aperire atque ipsa Scriptura. Itaque diligens attenta frequensque lectio tum meditatio et collatio Scripturarum, omnium summa regula ad intelligendum mihi semper est visa. Nam ex aliis Scripturis aliæ optime intelliguntur . . . obscuram aperta, dubiam certa interpretatur. Jos. a Costa. De Christo revel. lib. iii. c. 21.*

³ *Optima illa regula est ad obscuriores Pauli locos intelligendos et explicandos, si loci similes qui de eadem re edisserunt inter se conferantur, nam unus solet alterum illustrare. Salm. sup. Ep. Paul. libr. i. disp. 10.*

painfully to track out in their works the language which they have used respecting the eucharist, and ascertain from this source whether the Romanists interpret these words rightly or not. Now it will not be denied that the Romanists pretend to make out a case from the Fathers in favour of their view. So that at once we are met with the difficulty of having to decide between the claims of the Romanists and Protestants to tradition, while men in general are obliged to take the representations of both sides on trust, being unable to search through hundreds of volumes to ascertain for themselves what is the real state of the case. And if we do make the search, most men would find themselves, through the obscurities, contradictions, and exaggerated statements of the Fathers, involved in a complete labyrinth, needing a guide continually at their elbow. I would be understood, indeed, distinctly and firmly to maintain, that the argument from antiquity is, to those who are able rightly to estimate the evidence upon which it is founded, undeniably against the Romish doctrine in this matter. But at the same time, from the hyperbolical language and ambiguous terms which *some* of the Fathers have admitted, it is an inquiry which might considerably perplex and embarrass an ordinary reader; nor can it be denied that their injudicious language on this subject is calculated to lead even more learned readers, predisposed in favour of the doctrine, to conclude that it has at least respectable patristical testimony in its favour.

But now let the weary inquirer, who perhaps has lost his way in this trackless desert, (and let him be an unlearned one if you please,) turn to the pages of Scripture. His first question (staggered as he must naturally be with the notion that the bread and wine he receives at the eucharist are the natural and corporeal body and blood of Christ) will be, *Must* these words be thus understood? Are such expressions never used figuratively in Scripture? He finds the following passages;—"I am the door of the sheep." (John x. 7.) "I am the true vine."

(John xv. 1.) "They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, *and that rock was Christ.*" (1 Cor. x. 4.) He sees, then, that such expressions are at least sometimes used in Scripture figuratively, and that the word "is," may mean "bears the character of," or, "represents," or, "is figuratively." He looks to the context, and he finds that, *after* the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord said;—"This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE (τουτου του γεννηματος της αμπελου) until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." (Matt. xxvi. 28, 29.) And again, in Mark,—"*This is my blood I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until,*" &c. (Mark xiv. 25.) Then, saith our unlearned inquirer, it is still "*the fruit of the vine*" after consecration, for our Lord himself calls it so after he had given his disciples the cup, and pronounced the words, "This is my blood."

I know not why our unlearned inquirer should be *compelled* to proceed any further in his investigation, but if he is desirous of doing so, he will next take the parallel passages, and he finds that the expressions used by Luke and St. Paul are, "This is my body," and, "This cup is *the New Testament in my blood.*" (Luke xxii. 20; and 1 Cor. xi. 25.) Now either both of these expressions must be understood literally, or both figuratively; and seeing that no one supposes that the cup or that which is in it is changed into a testament, neither is the bread changed into the body of Christ. In the latter words, indeed, there is evidently a double figure, the cup being put for that which it contains. And further, in the latter passage the bread and wine are three times over said to be bread and wine *after* consecration. "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, &c.;" "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup, &c.;" "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." (vv. 26—28.)

And the further he carries his search, the more will he find this view of the matter confirmed. For instance, let him compare the text, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." (John vi. 54.) Now if this does not refer to the eucharist, (as many think,) then it is evident that we may eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood by an act of the soul, unaccompanied by any corporal act; but if it does refer to the eucharist, then that it is a spiritual eating and drinking, and not a corporal, is evident, because many partake of the bread and wine in the eucharist who have not eternal life. And so, on the same occasion on which our Lord inculcated the necessity of thus eating his flesh and drinking his blood, he shows the figurative character of his words when he says, "He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." (ver. 35.)

Lastly, let him view this passage as it stands connected with the general scheme of Scripture doctrine upon the subject. The object for which we "eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood," is that we may possess that life which he came to bestow upon us. What, then, is the testimony of Scripture as to the purpose of Christ's coming, the nature of the life we derive from him, and the mode in which we become partakers of it?

Scripture tells us that all mankind are in a state of spiritual death; "dead in trespasses and sins;" (Eph. ii. 1;) dead, as under God's wrath and condemnation; dead, as living in the love and practice of sin; for "she that liveth in pleasure," says the Apostle, "is dead while she liveth." (1 Tim. v. 6.)

From this spiritual death it tells us that Christ came to rescue us; and the life which he brings is spiritual life, consisting in (1) the pardon of our sins; for "you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with Christ, *having forgiven you all trespasses*," (Col. ii. 13;) and (2) a renewal of the soul, for we are "created in Christ Jesus unto good

works," (Eph. ii. 10,) and "if any man be in Christ he is a new creature," (2 Cor. v. 17,) "renewed in the spirit of his mind," and "created in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. iv. 23, 24.)

But this spiritual life, consisting of pardon and reconciliation with God, and a renewal to a life of holiness, was obtained for us, Scripture tells us, by the offering of the flesh and blood of Christ upon the cross. For "we have redemption through his blood." (Eph. i. 7.) "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God, by the death of his Son." (Rom. v. 10.) "He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh, through death." (Col. i. 21, 22.) "He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." (Tit. ii. 14.) So that the flesh and blood of Christ, offered upon the cross, procured for men these blessings.

Hence we have at once a strong confirmatory argument that, seeing it is spiritual life, the life of the soul, for which Christ came and was offered, his flesh and blood can be food only in a spiritual manner, being food for the nourishment of the soul.

But let us further observe how Scripture itself tells us that we obtain these blessings, purchased by Christ's death. It is by *faith in that sacrifice* as the atonement for our sins. Jesus Christ "God hath set forth to be a propitiation, *through faith in his blood*, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, &c." (Rom. iii. 25.) And saith our Lord, "He that believeth on me, hath everlasting life." (John vi. 47.) Therefore the flesh and blood of Christ, offered upon the cross, become life to the soul, when we rest upon them by faith, as the foundation of our hopes before God.

Hence the flesh and blood of Christ become, by faith, a restorative to the soul, giving it spiritual life and health.

And to the faithful, taking the bread and wine in a believing and thankful remembrance of Christ's death, the flesh and blood of Christ, represented by the bread and

wine, are *verily and indeed* food to their souls; food truly received by them in a spiritual manner, and effectual to the nourishment of their souls. For “he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.” (ver. 57.) “My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.” (ver. 55.) As our Church expresses it, “The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by *the faithful* in the Lord’s supper;” (Catech.) and by “the faithful” *only*; for “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*; and the *mean* whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper, is *faith*.” (Art. 28.) And he only who thus, i. e. by faith, eats the flesh, and drinks the blood of Christ, can possess spiritual life. For saith our Lord, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” (John vi. 53.)

And our Lord’s observations in this chapter (John vi.) show us, as we have already observed, that there may be such an eating and drinking, by faith only, without the external symbols. And even Romanists themselves confess that when our Lord speaks in this chapter of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, he means “faith in his death.”¹

And this our Church teaches us, in her office for the communion of the sick, in these words;—“If a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or &c., or any other just impediment, do not receive the sacrament of Christ’s body and blood, the curate shall instruct him that, if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, *he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul’s health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth.*”

But, doubtless, the effectual operation of this spiritual

¹ See Card. Caietan’s Comment. on this passage.

food upon the soul may be more especially *looked for* in the celebration of that sacramental rite which is an ordinance of Christ's own appointment for the faithful and thankful commemoration of his death.

Now there is nothing in all this beyond the power of any man of good common understanding, who will make the Bible his study. And such is the clearness and fulness of the Divine volume, on all important points, that it is sometimes found (I appeal to the experience of those who have had opportunities of making the observation) that a poor unlearned cottager, who has been a diligent student of his Bible, *may* have a firmer hold of truth, and a better insight into the genius and doctrines of Christianity, than those who have been labouring for years in the field of theological study.

But the misfortune is, that men will not generally thus study their Bibles. And no doubt it must be added that there are some understandings that need guidance and instruction. Such, also, is the negligence and indifference of men in spiritual things, that they need to have the truth urgently set before them; to have even that information which is accessible to them, and placed within their reach, put, as it were, in their hands, with a call upon them to attend to it.

Here, then, comes in the office of the minister of Christ; and we are thus reminded of an objection sometimes made to the views we have been advocating, and the answer to it.

It is objected,—

If the Scriptures are perspicuous enough to teach the faith, then the ministerial office, and all such helps, are useless; but the latter is inconsistent with the declarations of Scripture and experience, and therefore the former.

Here, though the premises are most true, the conclusion is altogether inconsequent and absurd. The clearness and fulness of the written word to those who can and will make use of it, are far from affecting the value and importance of the labours of the minister of Christ. For,

not to mention other duties of his office, such as the ministration of the sacraments, &c., there are, in the first place, children and illiterate persons, who cannot even read, and there are a large number,—must I say the majority?—who *will* not read, to be instructed by him. Further, there is a large number, whose secular engagements are allowed to stand in the way of an earnest and attentive perusal of Scripture, who therefore need to have things plain to the student of Scripture pointed out to them. Above all, he has to contend with the corruptions and prejudices of human nature, to induce it to receive the truths of Scripture as there delivered. The negligence, the indifference, the prejudices, the voluntary ignorance of men, require all, and more than all, his energies. It is his to be the diligent prayerful student of the word of God, and point out to men what he finds there. It is his to direct and quicken the researches of his flock into that sacred volume. It is his to point out what is, indeed, accessible to all, by a little attention and study; but which, through indifference and worldly-mindedness, needs to be enforced on their attention.

And in this matter, as far as concerns the articles of faith contained in the creed, even Thomas Aquinas will teach us better doctrine than our opponents. Speaking of the creed, he proposes this objection to be solved; “It appears that the articles of the faith are placed improperly in a creed. For Holy Scripture is the rule of faith, which it is not lawful to add to, or take away from. For it is said, Deut. 4. ‘Ye shall not add to the word which I speak unto you; neither shall ye take away from it.’ Therefore it was unlawful to constitute any creed a rule of faith, after the Holy Scripture was published.” To this he replies as follows;—“To this it is to be answered, that the truth of the faith is contained in Holy Scripture diffusely, and in various ways, and in some obscurely; *so that, to extract the truth of the faith from the Holy Scripture, there is required long study and exercise*; to which all those to whom it is necessary to know the truth of the faith can-

not attain, *most of whom, being occupied with other business, have no time for study*; and *therefore* it was necessary that, from the declarations of the Holy Scripture, something clear should be collected in the way of summary, which might be proposed to all for their belief; which is not, indeed, added to the Holy Scripture, but rather *taken from the Holy Scripture.*"¹

Here, then, no obscurity is supposed but what the *study* of the Scriptures is sufficient to remove; and the use of the Church in making the creed is, not to lay down articles of faith as from the Scriptures, which men studying the Scriptures could not themselves find there, but to abridge the time and consideration required for a comprehensive view of and search into the Scriptures, in aid of those who are occupied in worldly business.

And if we go beyond the prime articles of the faith, (which, however, be it observed, I do not limit to those in the Apostles' Creed,) who will deny that there are points, important points, revealed in Scripture, in which all may be much indebted to the labours of those who, at various periods of the Church, have, by extensive collation of Scripture with itself, by long and deep thought, study, and meditation, and doubtless, in many cases, by the guidance of the Spirit of God, elucidated the declarations of Scripture. It was well said by Gregory the Great, that there are in Scripture shallows which a lamb might ford, and depths in which an elephant might swim. There

¹ Videtur quod inconvenienter articuli fidei in symbolo ponantur. Sacra enim Scriptura est regula fidei cui nec addere nec subtrahere licet. Dicitur enim Deut. 4. Non addetis ad verbum quod vobis loquor neque auferetis ab eo. Ergo illicitum fuit aliquod symbolum constituere quasi regulam fidei post sacram Scripturam editam Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod veritas fidei in sacra Scriptura diffuse continetur et variis modis et in quibusdam obscure; ita quod ad eliciendum fidei veritatem ex sacra Scriptura requiritur longum studium et exercitium, ad quod non possunt pervenire omnes illi quibus necessarium est cognoscere fidei veritatem, quorum plerique aliis negotiis occupati studio vacare non possunt; et ideo fuit necessarium ut ex sententiis sacre Scripturæ aliquid manifestum summarie colligeretur, quod proponeretur omnibus ad credendum, quod quidem non est additum sacre Scripturæ, sed potius ex sacra Scriptura sumptum. THOM. Aq. Summ. Theolog. Sec. sec. q. 1. art. 9. ed. Paris. 1631.

are many passages in which we need all the helps we can obtain ; and after all, perhaps, notwithstanding "tradition," must remain uncertain of their meaning.

Nor is it one of the least uses of pastoral teaching, and commentaries upon the Scriptures, to rescue them from the misinterpretations to which, from various causes, and especially from the corrupt prejudices of the natural mind, they have been subjected ; and to the influence of which all are more or less exposed. The mind is often prepossessed at an early age in favour of incorrect views ; and most come to the Scriptures rather to confirm their preconceived notions, than to learn the truth from the word of God ; and, alas ! with minds in which, beyond the erroneous ideas that may have been instilled by others, there are sure to be, more or less, many innate prejudices to operate against the reception of the truth. It is of great importance, then, that the objections, difficulties, and misinterpretations that have been, or are likely to be, raised by the natural mind, should be cleared away, that the truth may be more *easily* seen.

Hence, moreover, the importance of that *confirmation* of the truth, which we derive from the writings of the Fathers, the creeds, confessions, and Conciliar determinations of the early Church. However clearly the truth may be laid down in Scripture, the prejudices of the natural mind, as well as the various discordant interpretations given to it, throw difficulties in the way of its reception. Both these causes will tend to create self-distrust ; and the latter to produce perplexity. A consciousness, then, of a liability to be deceived, will naturally and properly make the humble and sincere enquirer after truth anxious to know how others have understood it. He will be desirous of hearing the explanations which may be offered by those whose opinion he respects ; or who, like the early Fathers, might have had some facilities which he does not possess, for learning the right interpretation of Scripture. In a word, he will seek for a confirmation of his view of Scripture truth,

from the writings of the best and wisest of those who have, at various times, been received as teachers in the Church; and if he can find no such confirmation in an important article of faith, he will justly be led to question the correctness of his deductions from Scripture in the matter.

Such writings, then, will be of essential service in counteracting the tendencies of corrupt prejudices, in showing the incorrectness of plausible misinterpretations, in pointing out the truth to those who care not to study the Scriptures in order to learn it; and as a continual check upon the presumption and extravagance of the human imagination.

We are far indeed, then, from depreciating the value and importance of ministerial labours, and the treasures of sound instruction to be found in the ecclesiastical writers of former times; but we, at the same time, hold, that when God has spoken, man is responsible to God for believing and acting upon what God appears to him to have said. And we hold that the best expositor of the difficulties of Scripture, is Scripture.

Nor is there any ground for the charge of presumption which our opponents are so fond of making against individuals who assume to themselves the right of judging what is the meaning of Scripture in the fundamental articles of the faith; for they forget that there is hardly a single point upon which the authority of doctors and councils may not readily be quoted for views directly at variance with each other.

The only other objection of any weight to the view for which we here contend, is the following.

It is said,—

Men differ about the meaning of the Scriptures, or, as it is sometimes stated, The Scriptures do not teach the truth so as to prevent men from erring; and therefore they are not clear, not perspicuous enough to teach the faith.

On this plea I have already had occasion to offer some

remarks ; but as it is one of the great arguments of our opponents, I feel called upon to revert to it in this its most appropriate place.

If this be a solid objection, then it follows that nothing can be clear about which men disagree. Are our opponents prepared to venture such an assertion ? Are they prepared to say that when St. John says, "The Word was made flesh," the denial of the incarnation by some heretics shows that Scripture is obscure on this point ; or that when he says, "The Word was God," the denial by some of the divinity of the Son in any sense, shows that Scripture is obscure on that point ? Are they prepared to say that our Lord did not give clear evidence of his divine mission, because men disagreed about it ?

In fact, our opponents may be confuted in this matter by their own admissions. For they allow that the sense of Scripture is clear when it is pointed out.¹ But men differ about the meaning as much after it has been thus pointed out as before. Consequently, according to their own statements, the fact that men differ in such a matter is no proof that the truth is not clearly delivered.

Indeed, if nothing be plain about which men disagree, then it is not plain that Christianity itself came from God, for many do not believe that it did.

A man may shut his eyes at noon day, and declare that he cannot see the sun ; but this is no proof that it is doubtful whether the sun shines or not, nor does it show that further light is necessary to enable us to see the sun. And there are various ways in which the eyes of the mind may be shut to the truth, when it is shining upon us in its full strength. They may be shut by the natural corruption of our hearts ; by that worldly-minded spirit that leaves us a prey to the god of this world, who blinds the minds of those who believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them ; by prejudices against the truth ; by negligence in availing our-

¹ Newm. Lect. p. 165.

selves of the instruction given ; by apathy and indifference ; and, lastly, they are shut to any saving view of the truth by that self-confidence which makes us depend upon our own strength and imaginations, and neglect earnest prayer for that Divine aid and illumination which can alone enable us to receive the truth *in the love of it*. It is not " tradition," or any teaching of the Church, that can make men understand and receive the faith. The cause of their non-reception of it is not in the obscurity of the Scriptures, but in the state of their own minds ; and as long as that remains the same, they will warp the Scriptures, and the Fathers too *if they think it worth their while*, to their own views and notions. Is it a remark bordering upon severity to say, that those who misinterpret the Scriptures on *fundamental points*, must be culpable in one or more of the ways above alluded to ? He must have a high idea of human nature who can find fault with the remark on that ground.

The objections commonly made to the views advocated in this chapter may, I believe, be all summed up in the two we have just noticed. With these observations, then, I leave them with the reader.

We shall see, in the following chapters, that in the remarks here made as to the clearness of Scripture in all vital points, and its being the best expositor of itself, I am only taking the ground which has been occupied before me by some of the best and wisest both of antient and modern divines.

Before proceeding further, however, I will here add the testimonies of two learned divines of our Church on the subject.

The first is from Dr. Chaloner, written in the time of James I. It is in reply to the Popish objection, How can we know the sense and meaning of Scripture but by the exposition of the Church ? " I answer," he says, " that although all places of the Scripture are not alike perspicuous, as all are not alike necessary to salvation, yet for the opening of the sense thereof, so far as is be-

hoofefull for his Church, God is the best interpreter of his own meaning, expounding outwardly one place of the word by another, and inwardly both opening one's eyes to discern and inclining one's heart to assent unto the truth. As for those who cannot see but with the Pope's spectacles, and *pretend the Scriptures to be everywhere throughout so overshadowed with a mist that nothing presents itself clearly to their view*, I wonder the less at them, because their blindness is such that they cannot see to serve God without burning tapers and lighted candles at noon day."¹

The second is from the pen of one of the most able of our modern prelates, Bishop Horsley, with which I shall conclude this chapter: "It should be a rule," he says, "with every one who would read the Holy Scriptures with advantage and improvement, to compare every text which may seem either important for the doctrine it may contain, or remarkable for the turn of the expression, with the parallel passages in other parts of Holy Writ; that is, with the passages in which the subject matter is the same, the sense equivalent, or the turn of the expression similar Particular diligence should be used in comparing the parallel texts of the Old and the New Testaments It is incredible to any one, who has not in some degree made the experiment, what a proficiency may be made in that knowledge which maketh wise unto salvation, by studying the Scriptures in this manner, without any other commentary or exposition than what the different parts of the Sacred Volume mutually furnish for each other. *I will not scruple to assert, that the most illiterate Christian, if he can but read his English Bible, and will take the pains to read it in this manner, will not only attain all that practical knowledge which is necessary to his salvation, but, by God's blessing, he will become learned in everything relating to his religion in such a degree, that he will not be liable to be misled*

¹ Credo ecclesiam, &c. ed. 1638. pp. 105—7.

either by the refined arguments or by the false assertions of those who endeavour to engraft their own opinion upon the oracles of God. He may safely be ignorant of all philosophy, except what is to be learned from the sacred books, which indeed contain the highest philosophy adapted to the lowest apprehensions. He may safely remain ignorant of all history, except so much of the history of the first ages of the Jewish and of the Christian Church as is to be gathered from the canonical books of the Old and New Testament. Let him study these in the manner I recommend, and let him never cease to pray for the illumination of that Spirit by which these books were dictated; and the whole compass of abstruse philosophy and recondite history shall furnish no argument with which the perverse will of man shall be able to shake *this learned Christian's faith*. The Bible thus studied will indeed prove to be WHAT WE PROTESTANTS ESTEEM IT, A CERTAIN AND SUFFICIENT RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, a helmet of salvation, which alone may quench the fiery darts of the wicked.”¹

¹ Horsley's Nine Sermons on the Resurrection and other subjects. Sermon. 5. Sermon. ed. 1829. vol. ii. pp. 373—5.

CHAPTER X.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS ON THE SUBJECT OF
THIS WORK.

SECT. I.—PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

IN proceeding to review the sentiments of the Fathers on the subject of this work, I would offer in the first place a few general remarks, that may tend to assist the reader in forming a right judgment of them.

It is always difficult to give, by a few brief extracts, any correct notion of the full spirit and force of a writer's testimony to a point like that before us, in which his views are very much shown by the general tone of his remarks, and the whole course of his arguments. And it is still more difficult in the present case, from the misinterpretation to which the works of the Fathers have been subjected from the Romanists and our opponents.

Before I proceed further, therefore, I would caution the reader against allowing himself to be misled by sentences taken apart from their context, or phrases used in common by the Fathers and our opponents, but with a different meaning.

For instance, it is easy to find, in the works of the Fathers, as in the Catholic writers of later times, an appeal to the writers that preceded them, in confirmation of the orthodoxy of the doctrine they are inculcating. And these appeals are sometimes most incorrectly cited as proofs of their having maintained the pseudo-catholic notion that the Fathers are the authorized interpreters of Scripture, and patristical tradition a practically infallible

informant; whereas it will almost invariably be found, where such passages are examined, that the doctrine has been placed altogether upon the foundation of Scripture testimony, and the appeal to preceding writers in confirmation of it, made only with the view of showing that such an exposition of Scripture was no novelty, but not as if the testimony of a few ecclesiastical writers could be taken as an infallible expounder of God's word, or *per se* necessary to the right interpretation of it, on account of its imperfection and obscurity.

Another misinterpretation to which the writings of the Fathers have been subjected, (to which we have already alluded¹), and which has been more useful than any other to the pseudo-catholic cause, is the perversion of the meaning of the word "tradition," as used by the Fathers. The writings of the Romanists in particular abound with citations from the Fathers in which the whole force of the passage depends upon the meaning of this word, and where an examination of the context shows that it is Scripture to which the writer is referring; and thus, not unfrequently, the quotation which appears the most forcible to a superficial reader, turns out to be not only no evidence of what it is cited to prove, but precisely an evidence of the contrary. And, as we have already seen, our opponents have followed them in this, *so that Mr. Newman has actually quoted a passage of Athanasius in defence of his views, which is diametrically opposed to them.*² In the former part of this work, I have given several passages in proof of what we are here maintaining, namely, that the word "tradition" is frequently used in the Fathers in reference to Scripture.³ But as the point is of considerable importance, I will here add some further proofs of it, in order to show its *constant* use by them in this sense.

Thus Origen says,—“If any arrogant person chooses to slight or despise the declarations of the Apostles, let

¹ See vol. i. pp. 8, 69, 70, 74, 75.

² Vol. i. pp. 74, 5.

³ See vol. i. pp. 8, 69, 70, 74—76.

him look to it himself. I for my part think it right to cleave close, as to God and our Lord Jesus Christ, so also to his Apostles, and to inform myself *from the Divine Scriptures according to their own tradition.*"¹

Thus, also, Pope Felix III. says, "Observe, disciples of Christ and my children, *the traditions* which ye have received *from the Divine Scriptures.*"²

So Gregory Nyssen (already quoted) says, "It is believed . . . *from the tradition of the Scriptures.*"³

So Cyril of Jerusalem says, "Hold *the traditions* which ye now receive,"⁴ where, as his learned editor, Milles, observes, the word *traditions* refers to what he had just set before his hearers *from the Scriptures.*

So Cyprian (already quoted) frequently speaks of our Lord's words recorded in the Gospels, under the name of "*the Dominical tradition;*"⁵ and elsewhere, on the question of the rebaptization of heretics, exhorts (in similar language to the passage above quoted from him) a return to "*the Evangelical testimony and the Apostolical tradition,*"⁶ meaning the Gospels of the Evangelists and the Epistles of the Apostles.⁷

¹ Si quis vero arrogantia tumidus Apostolica dicta contemnit aut spernit ipse viderit. Mihi autem, sicut Deo et Domino nostro Jesu Christo, ita et Apostolis ejus adhærere bonum est, et ex Divinis Scripturis secundum ipsorum traditionem intelligentiam capere. In Levit. hom. 7. § 4. Tom. ii. p. 224.

² Φυλαξετε. Χριστου μαθηται. εμου δε υιοι, τας παραδοσεις ας παρελαβετε απο των θειων γραφων. FELIX III. Papa (fl. 483) in Epist. ad Petrum Fullonem Ep. Antioch. sub fin.; Concil. ed. Paris. 1671. Tom. iv. p. 1070.

³ Πειπιστευται εκ τε της κοινης υποληψεως, και εκ της των γραφων παραδοσεως. GREG. NYSS. De anim. et resurr. Tom. ii. p. 644. Ed. 1615.

⁴ Κρατειτε τας παραδοσεις ας νυν παραλαμβανετε. Catech. 5. § 8. Ed. Milles, p. 76. See the note of Milles in loc.

⁵ Traditio Dominica. See his Ep. ad Cæcil. Ep. 63. Ed. Pamel.

⁶ Quare si rejectis humanæ contentionis erroribus, ad Evangelicam auctoritatem atque ad Apostolicam traditionem sincera et religiosa fide revertamur, intelligemus, &c. Ep. ad Jubaianum, circa med. Ep. 73. Ed. Pamel.

⁷ For the use of the word *tradition* by the Fathers, see also IREN. adv. hæres. lib. iii. c. 25, p. 256, ed. Grab. (the word is also used, pp. 129, 131, 185 and 199); CLEM. ALEX. Strom. pp. 806 and 896. ed. Potter (al. pp. 679 and 762); CYRILL. ALEX. De recta fide ad Theodos. Tom. v. P. 2. p. 15. ed. Aubert.; ORIGEN. In Matth. tom. x. § 17. Op. vol. iii. p. 462. ed. Ben.

The description of the New Testament, occurring in these words of Cyprian, was one in very common use with the Fathers. Thus we find the Bible frequently referred to under the title, "The Law, the Prophets, the Evangelists, and the Apostles," as by Hippolytus,¹ Gregory of Neocæsarea,² Cyril of Jerusalem,³ Epiphanius,⁴ Salvian,⁵ and Hilary.⁶ So the New Testament is referred to by Origen,⁷ and Ephræm Syrus,⁸ as "the Evangelical and Apostolical sayings," by Hilary as "the Evangelical and Apostolical institutes,"⁹ and similarly by Gregory of Neocæsarea;¹⁰ just as in the passages formerly referred to it is called "the evangelical and apostolical traditions."¹¹ The Gospels are referred to by Theophilus of Antioch and Cornelius as "the evangelical voice;"¹² by

¹ Νομον, προφητας, ευαγγελιστας, αποστολους. HIPPOL. De antichrist. § 58. Ed. Fabr. vol. i. p. 28.

² GREGOR. NEOCES. In Annunc. Serm. ii. p. 19. ed. Par. 1622.

³ Ουχ' ἑτερον μὲν ἐν Νομῷ καὶ Προφηταῖς, ἑτερον δὲ ἐν Ευαγγελίοις καὶ Αποστολοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ ἐν Παλαιᾷ καὶ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ τὰς θείας λαλήσαν γραφάς. CYRILL. HIEROS. Cat. 17. § 3. ed. Milles, p. 243.

⁴ Οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν Ευαγγελικῶν καὶ Αποστολικῶν . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ Νομοῦ καὶ Προφητῶν. EPIPH. Adv. hæres. h. 31. § 15. tom. i. pp. 181, 2.—Ὅτι Θεὸς εἰς ἡμῖν ἐν Νομῷ καὶ ἐν Προφηταῖς καὶ ἐν Ευαγγελίοις καὶ Αποστολοῖς, ἐν Παλαιᾷ καὶ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ, κεκηρυκται. ID. ib. Exp. fid. Cath. § 18. tom. i. p. 1101.

⁵ Legem, Prophetas, Evangelium et Apostolicas lectiones. SALVIAN. De Gubern. Dei. lib. iii. p. 45.

⁶ Dilatis igitur . . . Evangelicis atque Apostolicis præconiis, omnis interim nobis de Lege et Prophetis adversus impios pugna sit. HILAR. De Trin. lib. v. § 6. col. 858. Ed. Ben.

⁷ Τῶν ευαγγελίων καὶ τῶν αποστολικῶν φωνῶν. ORIG. contr. Cels. lib. iii. § 15. tom. i. p. 457.

⁸ Diem semper adventus Domini prædictum Prophetiis et Evangelicis atque Apostolicis vocibus contempleris. EPHR. SYR. De Pœnit. tom. iii. p. 599.

⁹ Evangelicis atque Apostolicis institutis. HILAR. De Trin. lib. iv. § 1. col. 827. See also § 5, col. 829 and lib. vi. § 8. col. 882. Also Tract. in Psalm. § 23. col. 38.

¹⁰ Ὅταν ἀναγινωσκεται τὸ ευαγγέλιον, ἡ αποστολικὴ, μὴ προσχῆς τῷ βιβλῷ, κ. τ. λ. GREG. NEOCES. In Annunc. Serm. ii. p. 19.

¹¹ See vol. i. pp. 74, 5.

¹² Ἡ ευαγγελικὴ φωνή. THEOPH. Ad. Autol. lib. iii. § 13. ed. Ben. p. 388. ed. Col. 1686. p. 126. Sequentes evangelicam vocem dicentem, Beatos esse puros corde quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt. CORNEL. Ep. ad Cypr. ap. Cypr. Epist. 49. ed. Fell.

Epiphanius as “the evangelical witness;”¹ by Theodoret as “the evangelical declarations;”² by Gregory Nyssen as “the evangelical sayings;”³ “the evangelical teaching;”⁴ “the teaching of the gospel,”⁵ just as in the passage of Athanasius already referred to they are called “the evangelical tradition.”⁶ And, in like manner, the Apostolical Epistles are referred to by Gregory of Neocæsarea, under the title of “the Apostolical teaching.”⁷

And hence we may see the meaning of a passage in Epiphanius, (which the Romanists have as usual misrepresented) and add another example to the foregoing as to the use of the word “tradition.” Epiphanius at the close of his work against heresies, having noticed many usages that were received in the Church, adds, “But as it respects the other mysteries, namely concerning baptism and the more sacred mysteries, they are observed according as *the tradition of the Gospel and the Apostles directs* ;”⁸ where the reference is clearly to the New Testament, and an important testimony is afforded us as to the source whence Epiphanius considered our instructions for the celebration of the sacraments should be derived.

These passages may serve to put us on our guard against the representations of the Romanists and our opponents, as they clearly show us that the Fathers have been grievously misquoted, and their meaning often altogether perverted. When the Fathers speak of “the Apostolical tradition,” or “the tradition of the Apostles,” they are almost always referring to the Scriptures of the Apostles.

¹ Ευαγγελική μαρτυρία. EPIPHAN. adv. hæret. tom. i. p. 935.

² Ευαγγελικῶν κηρυγμάτων. THEODOR. Hæret. Fab. lib. v. c. 22. tom. iv. p. 452.

³ Ευαγγελικῶν φωνῶν. GREG. NYSS. Proœm. in Cant. vol. i. p. 471. ed. 1615.

⁴ Τῆς ευαγγελικῆς διδασκαλίας. Ib. p. 473.

⁵ Τῆς τοῦ ευαγγελίου διδασκαλίας. Id. De anim. et resurr. tom. ii. p. 639.

⁶ See vol. i. pp. 74, 5.

⁷ Ἡ ἀποστολικὴ διδασκαλία. In Annunc. Serm. ii. p. 19.

⁸ Τα δὲ ἀλλὰ μυστήρια περὶ λουτροῦ καὶ τῶν ἐνδοθεν μυστηρίων, ὥς ἔχει ἡ παραδosis τοῦ τε Ευαγγελίου καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, οὕτως ἐπιτελεῖται. EPIPH. adv. hæret. Expos. fid. cath. § 22. tom. i. pp. 1105, 6.

And to this we may add that when they speak of "the tradition of the Fathers," they are sometimes referring to something which those Fathers *gathered from Scripture*. For thus speaks Basil; "That therefore which our fathers said, that also we say But it is not sufficient for us, that this is the tradition of the Fathers; for they also followed the mind of Scripture, taking their first principles from those testimonies which we just now placed before you from the Scripture."¹ And to this other instances might be added.

In short the word *tradition* is often used, not to denote anything which has come down by successional delivery from the Apostles, but merely as equivalent to the *teaching* or *doctrine* of the persons referred to. Thus Polycrates speaks of having observed Easter "according to the tradition of my relations,"² where the word "tradition" is translated by Jerome by the word *teaching* or *doctrine*.³ There are, indeed, few passages of the Fathers in which, considering the sense usually affixed by the moderns to the word "traditions," the meaning of *παρὰδοσεις* would not be more accurately conveyed by translating it *doctrines* or *instructions*.

I shall now, then, endeavour to show more particularly that on all the five points in which we have summed up the views of our opponents,⁴ the weight of patristical tes-

¹ Ὅπερ ἐλεγον τοῖνυν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡμεῖς λεγόμεν . . . Ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἐξάρκει, ὅτι τῶν πατέρων ἡ παρὰδοσις· κακεῖνοι γὰρ τῷ βουλευματι τῆς Γραφῆς ἠκολούθησαν, ἐκ τῶν μαρτυριῶν ἃς μικρῶ προσθεν ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς Γραφῆς παρέθεμεθα τὰς ἀρχὰς λαβόντες. BASIL. De Sp. S. c. 7. tom. iii. p. 13. ed. Ben.

² Κατὰ παρὰδοσιν τῶν συγγενῶν μου. POLYCR. in EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. v. 24, or, Routh. Reliq. S. vol. i. p. 371.

³ Secundum doctrinam propinquorum meorum. See Routh. Reliq. S. vol. i. p. 371.

⁴ Which are as follows (as given vol. i. pp. 37, 8);—

1. That consentient patristical tradition or "catholic consent" is an unwritten Word of God, a divine informant in religion, and consequently entitled as to its *substance* to equal respect with the Holy Scriptures.

2. That such tradition is consequently a part of the divinely-revealed rule of faith and practice.

3. That it is a necessary part of the divine rule of faith and practice on account of the defectiveness of Scripture, for that

timony is incomparably in our favour. I say, *the weight of patristical testimony*, as I make no pretensions to the consent of all the Fathers on these or any other points, still less to so *clear* and *consistent* a testimony from all of them in our favour as would alone entitle us to claim that consent. And should there even be found, in some of those from whom we shall hereafter quote, observations in other parts of their works which appear not altogether consistent with what they have clearly expressed in the passages we have cited, still if our views are evidently maintained by them in those passages, and the principle there contended for, shall appear, upon that examination which we challenge, consistent with the general tone of their remarks and mode of arguing, then such apparent inconsistency, however it may be accounted for, is not sufficient to make such authors our opponents; or even to deprive us of the evidence in our favour afforded by the passages we shall quote; especially when we consider that the testimony given in our favour is in general expressed in a direct recognition of the claims of Scripture. It is but what we might expect from human nature that voluminous authors, especially those engaged in various controversies, may appear sometimes to have spoken somewhat inconsistently with that which they have plainly expressed elsewhere. And we must ever recollect how their works have been exposed to corruption, and the op-

(1) Though it does not reveal to us any fundamental articles of faith or practice not *noticed* in Scripture, Holy Scripture containing, that is giving hints or notices of, all the fundamental articles of faith and practice, it is yet a necessary part of the divine rule of faith and practice as the interpreter of Scripture, and as giving the full development of many points, some of which are fundamental, which are but imperfectly developed in Scripture, and

(2) It is an important part of that rule as conveying to us various important divinely-revealed doctrines and rules not contained in Scripture.

4. That it is a necessary part of the divine rule of faith and practice, because of the obscurity of Scripture even in some of the fundamental articles, which makes Scripture insufficient to *teach* us even the fundamentals of faith and practice.

5. That it is only by the testimony of patristical tradition that we are assured of the *inspiration* of Scripture, what books are *canonical*, and the *genuineness* of what we receive as such.

portunity afforded to heretics and pseudo-catholics of all kinds to palm upon the world spurious and corrupted works in their name.

And as it respects the general character of their views on the subject, it is admitted by Mr. Newman himself that while upon the supposition of their holding the views he advocates (which he takes it for granted they did), it is difficult to see why they should not have made "tradition" a sufficient informant in matters of necessary faith, independent of Scripture, yet they did not do so;¹ a tolerably clear proof that he has altogether misapprehended the mind of the Fathers.

Nor, indeed, is it easy to see why the early Church, if it held the views of our opponents, should have been so careful and diligent as we find it to have been in multiplying the copies of the Scriptures, translating them into all languages, and circulating them as the gospel of our salvation. The Divine Scripture, Augustine tells us, was diffused far and wide by the various translations made of it that it might become known to the nations *to their salvation*.²

SECT. II.—ON THE TRACTATORS' DOCTRINE OF CATHOLIC CONSENT BEING A DIVINE INFORMANT SUPPLEMENTARY TO AND INTERPRETATIVE OF SCRIPTURE.

IT is obvious that where so important a doctrine is held as that Scripture is but an obscure and imperfect informant even on the highest points of faith, and that our interpretation of it must be gathered from the consentient testimony of the whole primitive Church as a practically infallible witness of the oral teaching of the Apostles, we may expect it to be brought forward in a very direct way, and to occupy a prominent place in the instructions of

¹ Lect. pp. 342, 3. See vol. i. pp. 558, 9.

² *Innotesceret gentibus ad salutem.* AUG. De doctr. Christ. lib. ii. c. 5. Op. tom. iii. col. 21.

those who maintain it. If, then, the Fathers generally had held this doctrine, we should surely not have been left to gather it by inferences from passages only indirectly bearing upon it, but have had it distinctly placed before us as a necessary direction for our guidance. But it is undeniable that the Fathers generally have given us no such direction. If they had, we should not have been sent to Vincent, a monk of Lerins, as the great authority for this doctrine, but to some earlier and more estimable writer; though, by the way, even Vincent himself (as we shall show presently) is not answerable for all that our opponents have stretched his rule to mean.

There are, indeed, (as we have already had occasion to observe) appeals made by Irenæus, Tertullian and Origen, to the consent of the Apostolical Churches in favour of certain doctrines; and that consent they urge as a sufficient testimony to show that such doctrines were preached by the Apostles. How far these appeals support our opponents' cause we shall consider when we come to review the statements of those authors under our next head, and hope to show that they are altogether inadequate for that purpose.

Moreover, it is evident that some of those who lived near the times of the Apostles received the reports of individuals as sufficient testimony of the oral tradition of the Apostles on various points. Thus, for instance, we are referred by Irenæus to such reports in proof of the apostolicity of the doctrine he advocated on the subject of the millennium. And statements are made by others on other points respecting the oral teaching of the Apostles, grounded upon similar testimony. But it was soon found even at that early period that a ready entrance was thus afforded into the Church to errors of all kinds. We have already shown that even the catholic Fathers were led into error by such reports. And the heretics frequently made them the foundation of their extravagances. It was on this account, indeed, chiefly, namely from the heretics pleading a private tradition of

this kind in proof of the apostolicity of their errors, that the early Fathers appealed to the tradition of the apostolical churches in support of the orthodox faith. The Fathers did not point to this tradition as anything supplementary to Scripture, nor ever dreamed of saying that the Scripture *needed* such tradition as its interpreter, for, on the contrary, they always referred to Scripture as *manifestly* and *clearly* teaching their doctrine, but only as an additional proof in favour of the orthodox faith in a few of the most elementary points, to those who pretended a "tradition" from the Apostles coming to them through certain individuals in favour of their errors; and who said (as Irenæus tells us) that without a knowledge of that tradition Scripture could not be rightly interpreted.

So thought our opponents' own witnesses Bishop Patrick¹ and Bishop Taylor. The words of the latter are so well worth the consideration of our opponents that I will here subjoin them.

"In the first ages of the Church, the Fathers disputing with heretics did oftentimes urge against them the constant and universal tradition of the Church; and it was for these reasons—1. Because the heretics denied the Scriptures . . . 2. The heretics did rely upon this topic for advantage, and would be tried by tradition, as hoping because there were in several churches contrary customs there might be differing doctrines, or they might plausibly be pretended; and therefore the Fathers had reason to urge tradition and to wrest it from their hands who would fain have used it ill. . . . To such as these there were but two ways of confutation; one was, which they *most insisted upon*, that the Holy Scriptures were a *perfect rule of faith and manners*, and that there was *NO NEED OF ANY OTHER TRADITION*; the other, that the traditions which they pretended were false; and that the contrary was the doctrine which all the Churches of God did preach always. Now thus far tradition was useful to be pleaded; that is, though the heretics would not admit the doctrine

¹ See his *Treatise on Tradition*.

of Christianity as it was consigned in Scripture, yet they might be convinced that this was the doctrine of Christianity, because it was also preached by all bishops and confessed by all churches.”¹

In the Catholic Church itself that doctrine, which in one age had been through such reports attributed to the Apostles, I mean the millennial doctrine of Irenæus and others, was in another spoken of as the offspring of ignorance and folly.

It is evident, then, that many at least of the Fathers, even if they chose to avail themselves of such reports where they were consonant with their own views, did not in the abstract regard such testimony as of any authority. Nor, indeed, do the Tractators themselves appear to contend for the authority of “traditions” so derived.

The only testimonies that could be adduced in support of the doctrine of our opponents would be such as declared that in all important points there was a universal consent among all the teachers of the Catholic Church, and appealed to such consent as a “practically infallible” informant of the oral teaching of the Apostles.

I shall now, then, proceed to point out some passages in various of the early Fathers showing that the doctrine of the Tractators was not recognized by them. A more stringent proof perhaps will be found in the positive statements occurring under our next head as to the claims of Scripture, but it may be desirable to show first, that the notion of catholic consent being a divine informant supplementary to and interpretative of Scripture, and forming a necessary part of the rule of faith even in the highest points, was altogether unknown to them.

JUSTIN MARTYR. (fl. a. 140.)

Can we suppose, for instance, that Justin Martyr held such a view, who says, “There are some I admitted of our community (*γενομεν*) who confess that he [Jesus] is Christ, but affirm that he is a man, born of men; with

¹ Taylor's Rule of Consc. ii. 3. 14. Works, xiii. 116.

whom I do not agree, nor should I even if the great majority of those who are of my own religion should say so, since we are commanded by Christ himself to be ruled by, not the doctrines of men, but those preached by the blessed prophets and taught by him.”¹

ORIGEN (fl. a. 230.)

Let us proceed to Origen. We have already noticed the creed which he considered himself able to establish, by the consent of the Apostolical Churches at that time.² So much, then, we will leave for the present undisputed. But does this embrace all the vital articles of the faith? No; for Origen himself was unorthodox as to some of the highest. This creed, as it respects any of the questions now at issue in the Church, is practically useless. And as to anything beyond this, Origen not only makes no claim for the consent of the various Churches, but expressly speaks of it as open ground. And in his reply to Celsus he says, “Celsus remarks that they [i. e. the earliest Christians] were all of one mind; not observing in this, that *from the very beginning there were differences among believers respecting the meaning of the books that were believed to be divine.*”³ And further on, accounting for the variety of sects among Christians, of which Celsus had complained, he says that this arose “from many of the learned among the heathen being desirous of understanding the Christian faith; from which it followed that, from their understanding differently the words which were believed by all to be divine, there arose heresies, taking their names from those who were struck with the first principles of the word, but were somehow moved by some probable reasons to entertain

¹ Εἰσι τινες, ὡ φίλοι, ελεγον, ἀπο τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους ὁμολογούντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἀνθρώπων δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενομένον ἀποφαινομένοι· οἷς οὐ συντίθεμαι, οὐδ’ ἂν πλείστοι τὰντα μοι δοξάσαντες εἰποιεν· ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀνθρωπείους διδασκασίαι κεκελευσμεθα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πείθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς δια τῶν μακαρίων προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ δ.δασθῆναι. JUST. MART. Dial. cum Tryph. § 48. pp. 144, 5. ed. Ben. (ed. Col. p. 267.)

² See vol. i. pp. 226 &c.

³ See vol. i. p. 311.

different views of it, one from another.”¹ Clearly, then, Origen knew nothing of that traditive interpretation of Scripture, delivered by Catholic consent, which our opponents pretend to find sixteen centuries later. And as to the state of the Church in Origen’s own time, he himself tells us, “Many of those who profess to believe in Christ, disagree, not only in small points, and those of no moment, but also in important points, and those of the highest moment.”² And this difference of opinion existed among those who were in the Catholic Church; for again he says,—“I wish that those only who are without the Church were deceived; it would be easy to avoid the seduction. But now they who profess to belong to the Church, are deceived and misled, *even on the necessary points*; as their dissension is a witness. Since even those *who are within the Church* are misled It is bad to find any one erring in points of morals; but I think it is much worse to err in doctrines, and not to hold that doctrine which is *agreeable to the most true rule of the Scriptures* Every one that is perfect . . . and that has his senses exercised for understanding the truth, will necessarily, in his enquiries, fall in with many doctrines opposed to one another, and will hear many professing to know the truth, and *different traditions respecting it*.”³ What then, I ask, would have been Origen’s opinion of the doctrine of our opponents, that there was universal consent among all the teachers of the Catholic Church, in all the important doctrines of Christianity, for the first four or five centuries?

JEROME. (fl. a. 378.)

Again, what is the testimony of Jerome? “While,” saith he, “the blood of Christ was yet but recently shed in Judæa, it was maintained that the Lord’s body was but an appearance,” &c. And after enumerating several cases of error, he points out, as other instances, that “To

¹ See vol. i. p. 311.

² See vol. i. p. 226.

³ See vol. i. p. 432.

the angel of Ephesus there is imputed the loss of love. In the angel of the Church of Pergamos the eating of things offered to idols, and the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, are blamed ;" &c.,¹ showing that he held that there were many, even at that time, in the nominal Catholic Church, involved in serious error. And as to any notion that he could have supported the doctrine of our opponents as to the truth having been delivered in the catholic consent of the writers of the preceding ages, it is summarily overthrown by his language respecting the testimony of those writers on the great question that formed the subject of the Arian controversy. He admits fully that their works contain erroneous statements ; and when asked how he accounts for it, he replies,—“ It may be that they merely erred or wrote with another meaning, or their writings were gradually corrupted by unskilful copyists ; or certainly before that that meridian dæmon, Arius, arose in Alexandria, they may have spoken some things innocently and incautiously ; and that cannot escape the calumny of perverse men.”² He, then, who wrote thus, could not have supposed that the Catholic consent of these writers formed part of the rule of faith.

AUGUSTINE. (fl. a. 396.)

Let us pass on to Augustine. Having stated that to the Scriptures alone he had learned to give such honour as to suppose the writers of them certainly inerrable, he adds, respecting all other authors,—“ But others, however distinguished they may be for holiness and learning, I so read as not to think anything true, because they thought it to be so, but because they are able to persuade me, either by those canonical authors, or by some probable reason, that it is agreeable to the truth.”³ Now these words are quite irreconcilable with the notion that Augustine supposed the consent of those writers formed part of the rule of faith, and was a practically infallible informant of the oral tradition of the Apostles.

¹ See vol. i. p. 431.

² See vol. i. p. 371.

³ See vol. i. p. 282.

And, as we have already shown,¹ we find the Fathers of the Nicene and subsequent ages frequently blaming earlier Fathers of the catholic Church for unorthodox statements.

Here, then, whatever statements may be made elsewhere, we have at least sufficient evidence that no such doctrine as that of our opponents—that the catholic consent of all the teachers of the primitive Church forms part of the rule of faith—was a received doctrine of the early Church.

We are far, indeed, from denying that the Fathers were in the habit of appealing to those who had preceded them in confirmation of the correctness of their doctrines. Such appeals we ourselves make. Nay, such evidence might fairly be required by us for doctrines proposed to us as fundamental, not from any obscurity or insufficiency in the Scripture proof, but from its being impossible to suppose that all who went before were in error in fundamentals. But unless we can show real catholic consent, the testimony of a few witnesses on the subject is anything but infallible. Now such catholic consent the Fathers generally did not pretend to claim. Nor consequently did they put forward the patristical testimonies to which they referred as any divine informant, or authoritative witness, or practically infallible record of the oral teaching of the Apostles.

A remarkable passage in proof of this occurs in a fragment of a work called "the little Labyrinth," generally attributed to Caius, and written in the early part of the third century, against the heresy of Artemon. In this passage, which we have given at length in a preceding page,² it is said, "the heretics say that all the antients and the Apostles themselves both received and taught those things which they now affirm, and that the truth of the gospel was preserved until the times of Victor,

¹ Vol. i. pp. 279, &c. See, also, p. 245.

² See vol. i. pp. 236, 7.

who was the thirteenth bishop of Rome from Peter; but that from the time of his successor, Zephyrinus, the truth was adulterated. And the remark would perhaps be probable, but for that *first the Divine Scriptures opposed them*, and that there are writings of *certain brethren* older than the times of Victor, which they wrote against the heathen in defence of the truth, and against the heresies of that time How, therefore, is it possible, that when the doctrine received by the Church was preached so many years ago, all up to the time of Victor should have preached such doctrine as they say?"

Now here (as we have already observed) the claim of the heretics, that their doctrine was held and preached by the Apostles and all their earliest followers, is denied, first, because the divine Scriptures delivered a different doctrine, and secondly, because *some* of the earliest followers of the Apostles had left writings in which the contrary was maintained. In a word, the silly claim to catholic consent, or the everybody-always-everywhere-agreed-with-me argument, is left with the heretics, who, as we here see, could even then venture to make use of it, and heresy is refuted first by Scripture, and then antiquity is appealed to in confirmation, to show that what is considered the orthodox doctrine, the correct interpretation of Scripture, is no *novelty*, but has been held by many from the earliest times.

Further, that our opponents' doctrine on this subject was no received doctrine of the Church, is evident from the account given us by Socrates¹ of the proceedings at the Council of Constantinople in 381. For there we find the person put forward by the orthodox party as their champion, advising them, as a matter of prudence, and an expedient method of dealing with the heretics, to appeal to the writings of the Fathers, and make them the Judge of the controversy in hand. And the way in which this proposition was received by Nectarius, the

¹ Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 10.

bishop of Constantinople, and the Emperor, shows that the notion, so far from being a received doctrine of the Church, had not before occurred to them.

Moreover, when the appeal is made by the Fathers to those that preceded them, we find no claim made to the universal consent of all the teachers of the catholic Church. The statements of the Fathers above quoted show us how preposterous such a claim would have been, when there is hardly a Father who does not more or less find fault with some of those who had preceded him, as involved in some error. Their appeal was made to those whom they considered most worthy of being followed. And if in the heat of controversy they may have sometimes used words that seem to have a wider scope, those words must be interpreted with a recollection of their own admissions elsewhere.

Let us observe in what way Augustine introduces his reference to the Fathers in the Pelagian controversy. After having refuted the Pelagian errors by the testimony of Scripture, he proceeds to say,—“ But *since they say* that their enemies have adopted our language from hatred to the truth, &c. . . . when rather the Church of Christ, both of the West and the East, has been horror-struck at their profane and novel language; I think it concerns us not only to produce the testimony of the sacred canonical Scriptures against them, which we have already sufficiently done, but also to bring forward *some testimonies* from the writings of the saints who before our time have, with very great honour and renown, expounded those Scriptures; not that the authority of any disputant is put by us on a level with the canonical books, or, which could not be, that the opinion of one catholic is not as good and true as that of another catholic, but that those who think that such persons have some ground for what they say may be admonished, how on these points, before the Pelagians introduced their new and foolish phrases, catholic prelates *followed the divine declarations*, and may know that the true and antiently

established catholic faith is defended by us against the new presumption and destructive error of the Pelagian heretics.”¹ And he then proceeds to quote Cyprian and others in defence of his doctrines. Now this language, as the reader will have observed, is altogether different to that of our opponents.

In short, the mode of arguing adopted by the Fathers was like that of the Church of England. They said, The Scripture clearly affirms such and such a doctrine, therefore it is the orthodox faith. But to those who denied the correctness of their interpretation of Scripture, they urged this *argument, among others*, to show that it was the true one, namely, that such and such catholic Fathers had maintained it, and therefore that it was a doctrine that had been all along held in the catholic Church. And they probably recognized in general the necessity, in vital points, of having some authority in the teaching of those who went before them for their interpretation of Scripture, and therefore they referred to patristical tradition in support of the doctrines they advocated on such points; though even here the remarks of Basil upon the silence of the preceding Fathers on the doctrine of the divinity of the Holy Ghost,² show that the existence of such testimony was not always esteemed essential. But as it respects such a “catholic consent”

¹ Sed quoniam dicunt, Inimicos suos dicta nostra in veritatis odium suscepisse, &c. . . . cum potius eorum profanas vocum novitates Ecclesia Christi et occidentalis et orientalis horruerit; ad curam nostram existimo pertinere, non solum Scripturas sanctas canonicas adversus eos testes adhibere, quod jam satis fecimus, verum etiam de sanctorum litteris, qui eas ante nos fama celeberrima et ingenti gloria tractaverunt, aliqua documenta proferre; non quo canonicis libris a nobis ullius disputatoris æquetur auctoritas, [? *add here, aut, or, nec*] tamquam omnino non sit quod melius seu verius ab aliquo catholico quam ab alio itidem catholico sentiatur, sed ut admoneantur, qui putant istos aliquid dicere, quemadmodum de his rebus ante nova istorum vaniloquia catholici antistites [antistites] eloquia divina secuti sint; et sciant a nobis rectam et antiquitus fundatam catholicam fidem adversus recedentem [recentem] Pelagianorum hæreticorum præsumtionem perniciemque defendi. AUGUST. CONTR. duas epist. Pelag. lib. iv. c. 8, tom. x, col. 480. ed. Ben.

² See vol. i. p. 245.

as our opponents talk of, and the uses to be made of it, they evidently recognized nothing of the kind; still less did they dream of there being any such patristical testimony as could be proposed to all as a divine informant. *In fact, many of them have expressly declared, directly or indirectly, (as we shall see in the next section,) that the only divine revelation we possess is that contained in the Scriptures.*

The Fathers might say, as we should now, Such and such is the faith of the Church in fundamental points, and he who does not embrace that faith is in fundamental error. But this is not putting forward the dictum of that which we choose to call "the Church," as the *ground* upon which such doctrines are to be believed. It is merely an expression of our views, a bearing witness to what we hold to be the true Church and the true faith. And such alone is the character of the teaching which it becomes the Church on earth to offer. She is a witness for the truth. But never ought she to forget that the treasure of the gospel has been committed to earthen vessels, to those who are encompassed with infirmity, and that her delivery of the message is subject to all the drawbacks upon its authority to which the imperfection of a frail and fallible messenger renders it justly liable.

The truth of this is more especially apparent, when we recollect that "the Church" cannot teach as "the Church," but only through the agency of individuals. There is scarcely anything extant which can be called the teaching of "the catholic Church"; nothing, indeed, that *in strictness of speech* is entitled to that character. Because the catholic Church cannot be represented. Its suffrages never were and never could be collected on any one point. The utmost that was ever accomplished was a probable representation of the sentiments of the majority. The teaching of the Church, therefore, is *practically* the teaching of individuals belonging to the Church; and how uncertain it is what that teaching may be, *even where definite articles of belief on all the important points of the Christian religion have been voluntarily signed*, has

been proved to demonstration by the writings of our opponents themselves.

SECT. III.—WHETHER SCRIPTURE IS THE SOLE AND COMPLETE RULE OF FAITH AND JUDGE OF CONTROVERSIES.

In considering the testimony of the Fathers upon this subject, we need not fear to begin with some of the earliest; *though it is obvious that their language respecting it cannot be expected to be identical with that which they themselves would have used at the present day.* The immediate disciples of the Apostles, for instance, may be expected to speak of the oral teaching of the Apostles, which to them was as authoritative, as much the word of God, as the Scriptures. But consequently any notices from them, tending to confirm the view which we here advocate, are proportionably forcible.

Let us observe, then, the following passage of

IGNATIUS. (fl. a. 101.)

In his Epistle to the Philadelphians, written at the commencement of the second century, he says,—

“I exhort you that you do nothing out of strife, but according to the instruction of Christ; because I have heard of some who say, Unless I find it written in *the originals*, I will not believe it to be written in *the gospel*. And when I said, It is written, they answered what lay before them in their corrupted copies.” (§ 8. Wake’s transl.)¹

¹ Παρακαλω δε υμας μηδεν κατ’ εριθειαν πρασσειν, αλλα κατα Χριστομαθιαν. επει ηκουσα τινων λεγοντων, οτι εαν μη εν αρχαιοις ευρω, εν τω ευαγγελιω ου πιστευω. Και λεγοντος μου αυτοις, οτι γεγραπται, απεκριθησαν μοι, οτι προκειται. Εμοι δε αρχεια εστιν Ιησους Χριστος, τα αθηκτα (αδικτα) αρχειν ο σταυρος αυτου και ο θανατος, κ. τ. λ. IGNAT. Epist. ad Philadelph. § 8. Ed. Cotel. 1724. tom. ii. p. 32. The evident correspondence of the word *αρχαιοις* to the word *αρχεια*, occurring twice in the latter part of this passage, has caused Vossius, Cotelarius, Smith, and others to suppose that *αρχειοις* is the true reading; and this is the reading in the interpolated copy of these Epistles. The word *αρχαιοις* however may have the same meaning, for we are told in the lexicon of Suidas that the word is written both ways,—*Αρχεια . . . η*

Even at this early period, then, and in the presence of those who were the immediate disciples of the Apostles, the question as to any disputed point was, *Is it written?* For the animadversion upon those here alluded to, is not on the ground of their reference to Scripture, but of their cavilling at well-authenticated copies, and refusing to yield to anything but the Apostolical *autograph*.

From Ignatius, let us pass on to

POLYCARP. (fl. a. 108.)

In his Epistle to the Philippians, written in the year 116 or 117, we meet with the following passages; "These things, my brethren, I took not the liberty of myself to write unto you concerning righteousness, but you yourselves before encouraged me to it; for neither can I, nor any other such as I am, come up to the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul, who being himself in person with those who then lived, did, with all exactness and soundness, teach the word of truth, *and being gone from you, wrote an Epistle to you, into which if you look, you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith that has been delivered unto you, which is the mother of us all.*" (§ 3. Wake's transl.)¹

αρχαία, ὡς Ξενοφῶν Ιστοριῶν η. And Cotelarius says, "Αρχαίον pro αρχειον archivum legitur in Athenæo, Polluce, Suida et Josepho." There is as little reason, therefore, against translating both by the word *archivum*, as by the word *antiquus*; the evident correspondence of the words clearly showing an identity in their intended signification, and the sense of the sentence appears to me to forbid the latter. I confess, however, I do not feel satisfied with the above translation of *ὅτι προκειται*, nor with any which I have yet seen proposed. An account of the various modes of rendering this passage, is given in the late edition of the Patres Apostolici, by Mr. Jacobson. I should be inclined to translate the passage thus,—“And when I said, *It is written*, they answered me, *It is set forth thus* ;” (or, *is in the copies before us thus*;)—meaning that it was thus *set forth* in the common *copies*, but that it might not be so in the *originals*; and therefore that they would not allow the emphatic word *γεγραπται* to be used respecting it, till they had seen it in the original.

¹ Ταῦτα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐμαυτῷ ἐπιτρέψας, γράφω ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς προπεκαλεσασθε με. Οὐτε γὰρ ἐγώ, οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθεῖν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδοξοῦ Παύλου· ὃς γενομένος ἐν ὑμῖν κατὰ προσώπων τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων, ἐδίδαξεν ἀκριβῶς καὶ βεβαίως τὸν περὶ ἀληθείας λόγον· ὃς καὶ ἡμῶν ὑμῖν ἐγράψεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ἃς εἰς ἐγκυπτήγῃ, δυνήθη-

Again; "Whosoever perverts *the oracles of the Lord* to his own lusts, and says that there shall neither be any resurrection nor judgment, he is the firstborn of Satan. Wherefore, leaving the vanity of many, and their false doctrines, *let us return to the word that was delivered to us from the beginning*; watching unto prayer [1 Pet. 4. 7,] and persevering in fasting; with supplication, beseeching the all-seeing God not to lead us into temptation [Matt. 6. 13]; as the Lord hath said, The Spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak. [Matt. 26. 41.]"¹ (§ 7. Wake's transl.)

And again; "*For I trust that ye are WELL EXERCISED IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, and that nothing is hid from you.*" (§ 12. Ib.)²

These passages are worth observing, as showing how, even at that early period, the Scriptures were referred to for an authoritative report of the teaching of the Apostles.

JUSTIN MARTYR. (fl. a. 140.)

I proceed to Justin Martyr, of whom we may observe, first, that in his conference with Trypho the Jew, he makes it a rule to ground all his statements upon Scripture, and Scripture only;³ and exhorts Trypho to despise the tradition of his Jewish teachers, as under that name they palmed their own fancies upon the world.⁴ As

σεσθε οικοδομεισθαι εις την δοθεισαν υμιν πιστιν, ητις εστι μητηρ παντων υμων. POLYCARP. Ep. ad Philipp. § 3. Ed. Cotel. 1724. vol. ii. p. 187.

¹ 'Ὅς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ λέγῃ μὴτε ἀναστασιν, μὴτε κρίσιν εἶναι, οὗτος πρωτοτοκος ἐστὶ τοῦ Σατανα. Διὸ ἀπολιπόντες τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ τὰς ψευδοδιδασκαλίας, ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν παραδοθέντα λόγον ἐπιστρεψώμεν, νηφόντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχάς, καὶ προσκαρτεροῦντες νηστείας, δεήσειν αὐτοῦμενοι τὸν παντεποπτικὴν Θεόν, μὴ εἰσενέγκειν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα προθυμὸν, ἡ δὲ σαρὶς ἀσθενής. 1b. § 7. Ed. Cotel. 1724. vol. ii. pp. 188, 9.

² Confido enim vos bene exercitatos esse in sacris litteris, et nihil vos latet. 1b. § 12. Ed. Cotel. 1724. vol. 2. p. 191.

³ Καγὼ, ἐπεὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, τὰς τε ἀποδείξεις καὶ τὰς ὁμιλίας ποιοῦμαι, ἐλέγον, μὴ ὑπερτιθεσθε, μὴδὲ δισταζέτε πιστεῦσαι τῷ ἀπεριμήτῳ ἐμοί. JUSTIN. MART. Dial. cum Tryph. § 28. Ed. Bened. Paris. 1742. p. 126. (Ed. Colon. 1686. p. 245.)

⁴ Ἐτι καὶ παραδοξοτεροὺς δοκουντὰς ἄλλους λόγους ἀκουσέτε· μὴ ταρασσέσθε δέ, ἀλλὰ ὑαλλὸν προθυμότεροι γενομένοι ἀκροαταὶ καὶ ἐξετασταὶ μένετε, καταφύγο-

these remarks, however, apply only to Jewish traditions, and not to those of the Christian Church, (though it is hard to see why one should be secure from error, though the others were not,) I shall not press them as evidence on our present subject.

Again, in a passage already quoted, he says,—alluding to a heterodox doctrine prevailing among some professed Christians at the time,—“With whom I do not agree, nor could agree, even though the great majority of those who are of my own religion should say so; since we are commanded by Christ himself to be ruled by not the doctrines of men, but those preached by the blessed prophets, and taught by him.”

Further, as to the question of the fulness of the revelation made in the Scriptures, we may observe the following passages.—“Those,” saith he, “who have left us a relation of *all things that concern our Saviour Jesus Christ* have thus taught us.”¹ Again; “Neither did God ask Adam where he was, as one who knew not, nor Cain where Abel was; but for the purpose of convincing each of them what he was, *and that the knowledge of all things might be conveyed to us by their being committed to writing.*”²

IRENÆUS (fl. a. 167.)

We now come to an author who is very confidently appealed to, both by the Romanists and our opponents, as a supporter of their views, viz., Irenæus. The claim is made upon the authority of one or two passages, which need only to be compared with other parts of the work in which they occur, to show that they afford no support to the views, in defence of which they are adduced.

“By no others,” says Irenæus, “have we come to the

νουντες της παραδοσεως των υμετερων διδασκαλων’ επει ου τα δια του Θεου υπο του προφητικου Πνευματος ελεγχονται νοειν δυναμενοι, αλλα τα ιδια μαλλον διδασκειν προαιρουμενοι. Id. ib. § 38. p. 135. (Ed. Col. p. 256.)

¹ ‘Ως οί απομνημονευσαντες παντα τα περι του Σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου εδιδξαν. Id. Apolog. Prim. § 33. p. 64. (Ed. Col. Apolog. Sec. p. 75.)

² Ουδε τω Θεω εις ανοιαν ην το ερωταν τον Αδαμ, που εστιν, ουδε τον Καϊν, που Αβελ, αλλ’ εις το εκάστον ελεγξει οποιος εστι, και εις ημας την γνωσιν παντων δια το αναγραφηναι ελθειν. Id. Dialog. cum Tryph. § 99. p. 195. (Ed. Col. p. 326.)

knowledge of the plan of our salvation, but those through whom the Gospel came to us, which they then preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us *in the Scriptures* to be THE FOUNDATION AND PILLAR OF OUR FAITH;"¹ a testimony which one might suppose would be sufficient of itself to settle the question. But it stands not alone.

After having spoken of the witness borne by *Scripture* to the truth of his doctrine respecting God, he says,—“Having, therefore, the truth itself as *our rule*, and the testimony respecting God placed clearly before us, we ought not to cast away the firm and true knowledge of God,” &c.²

And again;—“But we, following the one only true God as our teacher, and taking *his words* as our *rule of truth*, always teach the same all of us on the same points.”³

And again;—“Therefore the disciple of the Lord, wishing to proscribe all such things, and to constitute a *rule of truth* in the Church . . . thus commenced the doctrine taught in his Gospel,—‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word, &c.’”⁴

And when, after having in his first and second books explained and shown the absurdity of the doctrines of the heretics whom he was opposing, he proceeds to *prove* their opposition to the doctrine of the Apostles, he professes only to be about to give that proof from their

¹ Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum. IRENEI adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 1. Ed. Grabe Oxon. 1702. fol. p. 198. (Ed. sec. Massuet. Ven. 1734. vol. i. p. 173.)

² Habentes itaque regulam ipsam veritatem, et in aperto positum de Deo testimonium, non debemus per quæstionum declinantes in alias atque alias absolutiones ejicere firmam et veram de Deo scientiam. Ib. ii. 47. p. 173. (M. ii. 28. p. 156.)

³ Nos autem unum et solum verum Deum doctorem sequentes, et regulam veritatis habentes ejus sermones, de iisdem semper eadem dicimus omnes. Ib. iv. 69. p. 368. (M. iv. 35. p. 277.)

⁴ Omnia igitur talia circumscribere volens discipulus Domini et regulam veritatis constituere in Ecclesia. . . . sic inchoavit in ea quæ est secundum Evangelium doctrina. Ib. ii. 11. (M. ib. p. 188.)

writings;¹ and he manifestly alludes to the tradition preserved in the Churches founded by the Apostles, only for the sake of convincing the heretics with whom he had to deal, who, he tells us, “When reproved from the Scriptures, immediately began to accuse the Scriptures themselves, as if they were not correct, nor of authority, and as if they were *ambiguous*; and as if the truth could not be discovered from them, by those who were ignorant of tradition, FOR THAT THE TRUTH WAS NOT DELIVERED IN WRITING BUT ORALLY.”² To meet these *heretics*, therefore, on their own ground, (to the similarity of whose views to those of our opponents, I need hardly point the attention of the reader,) he introduces *incidentally*, and *beyond his professed design*, the testimony borne by the creed professed in the various Churches founded by the Apostles, to the correctness of his doctrine. So evident is this, that the learned Romanist, Erasmus, scruples not to say that Irenæus in this work “fights against a host of heretics, with the SOLE aid of THE SCRIPTURES.”³

I will add two more passages in proof of this.

“On this account,” he says, “we labour to adduce those proofs which are derived from the Scriptures, that confuting them by the very words of God, we may, as far as is in our power, drive them from their enormous blasphemy.”⁴

And again;—“Using *those proofs which are from the*

¹ Ex ipsis demonstrabimus Scripturis in libris consequentibus Ex Scripturis divinis probationes apponemus. Ib. ii. 66. pp. 194, 195. (M. ii. 35. pp. 170, 1.) In hoc tertio ex Scripturis inferemus ostensiones. iii. Præf. p. 198. (M. p. 173.)

² Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex autoritate, et quia varie sint dictæ, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam sed per vivam vocem. Ib. iii. 2. (M. ib. p. 174.)

³ Solis Scripturarum prædiis pugnat adversus catervam hæreticorum. Erasmi Præf. in Iren. Vide ed. Mass. vol. ii. p. 152.

⁴ Propter hoc enim et laboramus eas quæ sunt ex Scripturis adhibere ostensiones, ut ipsi sermonibus confutantes eos, quantum in nobis est, cohibeamus eos a grandi blasphemia. Ib. iv. 68. p. 367. (M. iv. 34. p. 276.)

Scriptures, you may *easily* overturn, as we have demonstrated, all those heretical notions which were afterwards invented.”¹

I add below some further references to passages which may show the reader how constant was this reference to *Scripture* as *the* rule of faith.²

But our opponents will say, Look at those other passages to which you have just alluded, in which he so clearly directs us to the tradition preserved in the Church.

We have no hesitation in accepting the challenge, and fear not to direct the reader's attention to those passages. There is nothing in them which, in a writer of the second century, occasions us any surprise, or leads us to conclude that had Irenæus lived in our day, he would have taken any other view of our present subject, than that which we have taken; and which, in other passages, he has himself sanctioned. I shall now, without any intentional reserve, quote those passages that may be supposed to oppose our view.

We have already observed that his professed object, in his third and following books, is to refute the heretics whom he was opposing *from Scripture*. But seeing, as he tells us in the commencement of his third book, that these heretics, when convicted from Scripture, accused the

¹ Utens etiam his ostensionibus quæ sunt ex Scripturis facile evertis, quemadmodum demonstravimus, omnes eas quæ postea afflictæ sunt hæreticorum sententias. Ib. v. 14. p. 422. (M. ib. p. 311.)

² Οσατε κεῖται ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ἀναπτύσσειν. i. 4. p. 48. (M. i. 10. p. 51.) Si Scripturas cognovissent et a veritate docti essent scirent, &c. ii. 16. p. 136. (M. ii. 13. p. 130.) Didicimus ex Scripturis principatum tenere super omnia Deum. Unde autem vel quemadmodum emisit eam, neque Scriptura aliqua exposuit, neque nos fantasmari oportet. ii. 49. p. 177. (M. ii. 28. p. 158.) Ex Dominicis Scripturis ostendimus, &c. ii. 54. p. 182, 3. (M. ii. 30. p. 162.) Revertamur ad eam quæ est ex Scripturis ostensionem. iii. 5. p. 206. (M. ib. p. 179.) Ex ipsis Scripturis ostenditur. iii. 11. p. 224. (M. ib. p. 192.) Nobis conlaborantibus his ostensionibus quæ ex Scripturis sunt. iii. 12. p. 230. (M. ib. p. 197.) Ex Scripturis demonstravimus. iii. 21. p. 249. (M. iii. 19. p. 212.) Quando ex ipsis Scripturis arguantur a nobis Quæ secundum nos est fides manifestam ostensionem habens ex his Scripturis. iii. 25. p. 256. (M. iii. 21. p. 216.)

Scriptures of being incorrect and ambiguous; and that the truth could not be found out from them, by those who were ignorant of tradition;¹ he, *on that account*, and in order to bring an *additional* confutation of their errors from the source to which they professed to defer, refers them to tradition, viz., “that tradition which was from the Apostles, and was preserved in the Churches by the succession of Presbyters;” which tradition, it seems, they opposed also; and when thus driven to their last shift, boldly said that they were wiser than the Apostles,² as the great stickler for tradition, I mean the Pope, has *practically* done since. “Wherefore,” says Irenæus, “we must oppose them *in all ways*; if by any means confounding any of them by our refutation of their errors, we can induce them to turn and confess the truth. For if it is not easy for the mind, caught by error, to repent, yet it is not impossible for it to avoid error, when the truth is placed by it.”³ And then postponing for the moment his Scriptural demonstration, that he may bring forward the evidence derived from tradition, in order that he may oppose the heretics “*in all ways*,” he adds,—“Therefore it is open to all who wish to see the truth, to behold in every Church that tradition of the Apostles which was published throughout the whole world; and we can enumerate those who were appointed bishops in the Churches by the Apostles, and their successors even to our times, who have neither taught nor known anything of the kind, such as these persons dream of.”⁴

And then, having referred to Rome as at that time one

¹ See note ² p. 279.

² Ib. iii. 2. p. 200. (M. ib. p. 175.)

³ Quapropter undique resistendum est illis, si quos ex his retusione confundentes, ad conversionem veritatis adducere possimus. Etenim si non facile est ab errore apprehensam respiscere animam, sed non omnimodo impossibile est errorem effugere apposita veritate. Ib. iii. 2. p. 200. (M. ib. p. 175.)

⁴ Traditionem itaque Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam in omni Ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus qui vera velint videre, et habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos qui nihil tale docuerunt neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. Ib. iii. 3. p. 200. (M. ib. p. 175.)

of the principal of the Apostolical Churches, he reminds us that Clement has given us, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, "*the tradition* which he had lately received from the Apostles, announcing one God Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, the former of man, who brought on the deluge, and called Abraham, who led the people out of Egypt, who conversed with Moses, who ordained the law, and sent the Prophets, who hath prepared fire for the devil and his angels. They who will, may learn from the Epistle itself that He was proclaimed by the Churches to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and may understand *the Apostolical tradition* of the Church, since this Epistle is more ancient than those who now teach falsehoods, and feign that there is another God above the Demiurgus and Maker of all those things which exist."¹

And then, having proceeded to give the succession from Clement to his own time, he adds, "By this ordination and succession the tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth, hath come down even to us. And this is a full proof that there is one and the same lifegiving faith, which, derived from the Apostles, is still preserved in the Church, and delivered in truth." . . . "And Polycarp always taught these things, which he had learned from the Apostles, which also the Church delivers, and which alone are true. All the Churches in Asia bear witness to these things, and those who have succeeded to Polycarp up to this time."²

¹ Ἦν γεωσσι ἀπο τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδοσιν εἰληφεῖ annunciantem unum Deum omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ, plasmatorem hominis, qui induxerit cataclysmum, et advocaverit Abraham, qui eduxerit populum de terra Ægypti, qui colloquutus sit Moysi, qui legem disposuerit, et Prophetas miserit, qui ignem præparaverit diabolo et angelis ejus. Hunc Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi ab Ecclesiis annunciari, ex ipsa Scriptura, qui velint discere possunt, et apostolicam Ecclesiæ traditionem intelligere, cum sit vetustior Epistola his qui nunc falso docent, et alterum Deum super Demiurgum et Factorem horum omnium quæ sunt commentuntur. Ib. iii. 3. p. 202. (M. ib. p. 176.)

² Τη αὐτῇ τάξει καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διδασχῇ ἥτε ἀπο τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παραδοσις καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύγμα κατηντήκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς. Et est plenissima

The reader will not fail to observe, in the above notice of *the tradition* to which Irenæus refers, as having been given by Clement, *what* that tradition is, and how utterly useless it is to those who are appealing to tradition as something supplementary to Scripture.

The same remark applies to the passage I am now about to quote.

“Since, therefore,” he says, “there are such proofs, it is not right yet to seek the truth among others, which it is easy to take from the Church, since the Apostles fully treasured up in it, as in a rich storehouse, all things belonging to the truth, that every one who wished may take from it the water of life. For this is the door of life; but all the rest are thieves and robbers. . . . But what if the Apostles had not left the Scriptures to us? Would it not have behoved us to follow the order of the tradition which they delivered to those to whom they committed the Churches? Which rule many barbarous nations, of those who believe in Christ, follow, having salvation written, without paper and ink, by the Spirit in their hearts, and diligently keeping *the old tradition*; believing in one God, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things which are in them, through Jesus Christ, the Son of God; who, from his extraordinary love for his creature, condescended to be born of a virgin, himself uniting man to God, through himself, and suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rising again, and being received up in splendour, will come in glory as the Saviour of those who are saved, and the judge of those who are condemned, and send into eternal fire the corrupters of the truth, and the despisers of his Father and his advent. *This faith*, those who without letters have believed, are, as far as regards our language, barbarians; but, as it re-

hæc ostensio, unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in Ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate. . . . Ταῦτα διδάσκει [i. e. Πολυκαρπὸς], ἃ καὶ παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐμαθεν, ἃ καὶ ἡ Ἐκκλησία παραδίδωσιν, ἃ καὶ μόνῃ ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ. Μαρτυροῦσιν τοῖς αἰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐκκλησίαις πᾶσαι, καὶ οἱ μέχρι νῦν διαδεδογμένοι τὸν Πολυκαρπὸν. Ib. iii. 3. p. 203. (M. ib. pp. 176, 7.)

gards sentiment, and custom, and conversation, are, through their faith, extraordinarily wise, and please God, living in the exercise of all justice, and chastity, and wisdom. To whom if any one should announce those things which the heretics have invented, speaking to them in their own language, they would immediately stop their ears and fly far away, not enduring to hear such blasphemous discourse. Thus, through *that antient tradition of the Apostles*, they do not admit into their minds a thought of any of the monstrous doctrines of those heretics."¹

These are the passages usually adduced from Irenæus in support of the authority of tradition; and though there are some others (which I have referred to below ²) in which the Church is spoken of as the depositary

¹ Tantæ igitur ostensiones cum sint, non oportet adhuc quærere apud alios veritatem, quam facile est ab Ecclesia sumere; cum Apostoli, quasi in depositarium dives, plenissime in eam contulerint omnia quæ sint veritatis: uti omnis, quicumque velit,umat ex ea potum vitæ. Hæc est enim vitæ introitus; omnes autem reliqui fures sunt et latrones. Propter quod oportet devitare quidem illos; quæ autem sunt Ecclesiæ, cum summa diligentia diligere et apprehendere veritatis traditionem. Quid enim? Et si quibus de aliqua modica quæstione disceptatio esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas recurrere Ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli conversati sunt, et ab eis de præsentī quæstione sumere quod certum et re liquidum est? Quid autem si neque Apostoli quidem Scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine charta vel atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis salutem, et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes, in unum Deum credentes fabricatorem cæli et terræ, &c. . . . Hanc fidem qui sine literis crediderunt quantum ad sermonem nostrum barbari sunt: quantum autem ad sententiam et consuetudinem et conversationem propter fidem perquam sapientissimi sunt, et placent Deo, conversantes in omni iustitia et castitate et sapientia. Quibus si aliquis annuntiaverit ea quæ ab hæreticis adinventæ sunt, proprio sermone eorum colloquens, statim concludentes aures, longo longius fugient, ne audire quidem sustinentes blasphemum colloquium. Sic per illam veterem Apostolorum traditionem, ne in conceptionem quidem mentis admittunt quodcumque eorum portentiloquium est. Ib. iii. 4. p. 206. (M. ib. p. 178.)

² See lib. iii. c. 40. p. 266. (M. iii. 24. pp. 222, 3.) lib. iv. cc. 43, 44, 45. pp. 343—5. (M. iv. 26. pp. 261—3.) lib. iv. c. 52. p. 355. (M. iv. 32. p. 270.) lib. iv. cc. 62, 63. pp. 360, 1. (M. iv. 33. p. 272.) lib. v. c. 20. pp. 430, 1. (M. ib. p. 317.)

of the tradition of the Apostles, the above will, I suppose, be allowed to be as strong in favour of the authority of the tradition preserved in the Church as any that can be adduced.

Now from these passages it certainly follows that Irenæus held that in the Churches founded by the Apostles there was preserved *to his day* a correct tradition of *certain fundamental truths* orally delivered to them by the Apostles, handed down *to that time* through the succession of the pastors of those Churches, and that this was an independent proof of the truth of his doctrine against the heretics he was opposing. What then? Does it follow that *we* can reason in the same way? Obviously not. The *principle* applied by Irenæus is not applicable at the present day. He made these observations when the Church bore a totally different aspect; and therefore to use the name of Irenæus in defence of the authority of tradition in the present day, from his having made this appeal to the concurrent testimony of the Apostolical Churches in his own day, is to put forward a very false claim to confidence. He appeals to a fact which might then be verified; but this is anything but evidence, that had he lived sixteen centuries later he would have considered the testimony of a few antient authors as to the tradition preserved in their time in the Apostolical Churches, sufficient to clothe what they delivered as such with the authority of a divine informant. The present controversy may teach us the absurdity of such a notion; for even with respect to our own Church, with her written confessions, and varied documents of appeal, we and our opponents are directly opposed to each other, as to the *fact* of what her views are on several important points.

Further; he makes no appeal to that tradition for more than an enunciation of a few prime articles of the Christian faith, which in the fullest form in which he has given it we have quoted in a former page.¹ His

¹ See vol. i. pp. 113, 114, and 141, 142.

appeal, therefore, goes not far enough to make it of any real use to our opponents, for however useful it might be against the imaginary deities of Valentinus, or such like absurdities, as to any of the points for which our opponents want it, it will be of no avail.

The Tractators say, that Irenæus himself tells us, that if we had not Scripture we must follow tradition. True, he thus spoke to those of his own time as it respected a few of the prime facts of the Christian faith. But it does not follow that he would have said so to the present generation. Still less does it follow that he would have recommended those who have Scripture to follow tradition. The very fact that the truths of the Gospel were so carefully recorded in writing, and that the earliest heralds of it took such care to have the gospels transcribed, and leave them with their new converts, (as Eusebius tells us was the case,¹) shows that tradition was not considered a safe mode of transmitting doctrines. We deny not that God might have preserved his Church from error as easily without as with the Scriptures, but so he could under any circumstances.

And still further, Irenæus does not refer to this tradition as containing anything beyond what is in the Scriptures, but only as an additional argument that his doctrine was true, for the sake of those who, when convicted of error by the Scriptures, accused the Scriptures of imperfection and ambiguity. His opponents, when referred to Scripture, replied that this was not to be considered a full representation of what the Apostles had delivered, and could not be understood but by a reference to what tradition had delivered of the oral teaching of the Apostles. To which Irenæus replies, Let us then go to the Apostolical Churches, to see what they preach, for you must admit that they are the most likely depositaries of the oral teaching of the Apostles, and seeing that they are unanimously against you, you are refuted *on your own*

¹ Euseb, Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. c. 37. (ed. Vales.)

ground. And think not to urge that they have declined from the true faith, for we can tell you who all their bishops have been, from the times of the Apostles, and defy you to challenge any one of them as having corrupted the faith or preached your doctrines.¹

Nay, he expressly says that that which the Apostles preached they have delivered to us in the Scriptures, so that the statements of Irenæus, when taken as a whole, do not afford the least support to the views of our opponents.

For, as we shall now proceed to show, he clearly sets forth Scripture as containing fully *all* the Christian faith.

Thus, in a passage just quoted, he tells us that *what* the inspired authors *preached*, *THAT* *they afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in the Scriptures*, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith.² Holy Scripture, therefore, delivers the faith not imperfectly and partially, but fully. And if we are unable to explain all things in the Scriptures, “we ought to leave such things with God who made us, knowing well that the Scriptures are perfect as having been uttered by the Word of God and his Spirit; but we, in proportion as we are inferior and far removed from the Word of God and his Spirit, so far we lack the knowledge of his mysteries. And it is not wonderful if, in spiritual and heavenly things, and those things which have to be revealed, this should be the case . . . and we leave those things with God.”³

Far from supposing that the faith is imperfectly delivered

¹ So far episcopal succession in a Church may afford us a useful argument in disproof of corruption of doctrine in that Church, i. e. when all the links in the chain can be pointed out, and none accused of error. But how far this will sanction the notions of our opponents on this subject, is worth their consideration.

² See note ¹ p. 278.

³ Cedere autem hæc talia debemus Deo, qui et nos fecit, rectissime scientes, quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ; nos autem secundum quod minores sumus et novissimi a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus, secundum hoc et scientia mysteriorum ejus indigemus. Et non

in the Scriptures, and that the Church is in possession of a supplementary revelation, he warns us to recollect that the Scriptures are a perfect revelation of the Christian faith, and that so much as we cannot understand in the Scriptures we must leave with God.

And when about to refute the heretics from the Apostolical *Scriptures*, he says, that, considering their various errors, "we hold it necessary to produce *the whole doctrine of the Apostles concerning our Lord Jesus Christ*, and show that they held no such notion respecting him;"¹ and that *whole doctrine* he then proceeds to derive from the Scriptures.

He tells us, also, that "the precepts of a *perfect life*" are delivered "in both Testaments,"² so that the Holy Scriptures of each Testament are sufficient to reveal that portion of Divine truth which God intended for those who possessed them under each. And the exposition of the doctrine of the Apostles given by the true Church is "according to the Scriptures."³

And he says that when in his youth he heard Polycarp relating what he had heard from John and others, who had seen the Lord, of his miracles and doctrine, all things that he mentioned were "agreeable to the Scriptures;"⁴ which testimony, however it may be explained away by those who are desirous of doing so, is, notwithstanding, not a little in favour of the view for which we are contending.

est mirum, si in spiritalibus et cælestibus, et in his quæ habent revelari, hoc patimur nos . . . et Deo hæc ipsa committimus. Ib. ii. 47. p. 173. (M. ii. 28. p. 156.)

¹ Necessè habemus, universam Apostolorum de Domino nostro Jesu Christo sententiam adhibere, et ostendere, eos non solum nihil tale sensisse de eo, verum amplius, &c. Ib. iii. 17. p. 238. (M. iii. 16. p. 204.)

² Consummatæ enim vitæ præcepta in utroque Testamento cum sint eadem eundem ostenderunt Deum. Ib. iv. 26. p. 312. (M. iv. 12. p. 241.)

³ Secundum Scripturas expositio. Ib. iv. 63. p. 361. (M. iv. 33. p. 272.)

⁴ Απηγγελλε παντα συμφωνα ταις Γραφαις. Fragm. (ex Euseb. Hist. Eccl. v. 20.) p. 464. (Mass. p. 340.)

And he speaks of the Valentinians as persons who in relying upon traditions not delivered in the Scriptures were attempting to make ropes of sand.¹

And hence he says, "If any one should ask, what God did before he made the world, we reply that the answer to that rests with God. For that this world was made perfect by God, receiving a beginning in time, the Scriptures teach us, but what God did before this *no Scripture* manifests. *Therefore* the answer to this rests with God."²

And again,—“We have learned from the Scriptures that God is supreme over all; but whence or how he sent it [i. e. the substance of the Word] forth, neither hath *any Scripture* explained, nor does it become us to conjecture.”³ He must have added, “nor *tradition* revealed” had he held the views of our opponents.

And to conclude, he says,—“*Read* very diligently that Gospel which has been given us by the Apostles, and read very diligently the prophets, and you will find the whole course of action, and the whole *doctrine*, and the whole passion of our Lord proclaimed in them.”⁴ The passage was written against those who said that the prophets spoke under the influence of another God, and not the God who spoke by the Apostles, but (without straining the phrase “the whole doctrine of our Lord” to mean more than it necessarily implies) it bears strongly in favour of our present position. For it states that the whole doc-

¹ Εξ αγραφων αναγιγνωσκοντες, και το δη λεγομενον, εξ αμμου σχοινια πλεκειν επιτηδευοντες. Adv. hæ. i. 1. § 15. p. 35. (M. i. 8. p. 36.)

² Ut puta si quis interroget, antequam mundum faceret Deus, quid agebat? dicimus quoniam ista responsio subjacet Deo. Quoniam autem mundus hic factus est apotelesos a Deo, temporale initium accipiens, Scripturæ nos docent; quid autem ante hoc Deus sit operatus nulla Scriptura manifestat. Subjacet ergo hæc responsio Deo. Ib. ii. 47. p. 175. (M. ii. 28. p. 156.)

³ Didicimus enim ex Scripturis principatum tenere super omnia Deum. Unde autem vel quemadmodum emisit eam, neque Scriptura aliqua exposuit, neque nos fantasmari oportet. Ib. ii. 49. p. 177. (M. ii. 28. p. 158.)

⁴ Legite diligentius id quod ab Apostolis est Evangelium nobis datum, et legite diligentius Prophetas, et invenietis universam actionem et omnem doctrinam, et omnem passionem Domini nostri prædicatam in ipsis. Ib. iv. 66. p. 364. (M. iv. 34. p. 274, where however against edd. and MSS. *prædicatam* is turned into *prædictam*.)

trine of our Lord is in some sense proclaimed in the writings of the prophets, and that if Christians would read diligently both Testaments, and compare them, they would find this to be the case. But how, I beg to ask, could they do this unless the *two* Testaments *fully* and *perfectly* contained it, and moreover so contained it as that Christians might, *by diligent reading*, themselves *find it there*.

In conclusion, then, we may remark that even if Irenæus supposed himself to know anything of Apostolical teaching, through the reports of the Asian presbyters, or otherwise, beyond what was in Scripture, he makes such "tradition" no part of the rule of faith for Christians generally. *At that early period many might speak with respect of such reports of Apostolical teaching who did not set them down as indubitable divine informants, and forming part of the rule of faith to mankind.*

ASTERIUS URBANUS. (fl. a. 188.)

In a work against the Montanists written by a contemporary author, probably Asterius Urbanus, of which a fragment is preserved to us by Eusebius, we have a very remarkable evidence of the opinion of the early Church as to the complete perfection of Scripture, and the uniqueness of its character as a divine informant.

This author having been requested (as he tells us) to write a work against Montanism, he remained for some time doubtful what to do; "not [he adds] through any doubt of my being able to refute falsehood and bear witness to the truth; but from being fearful and cautious lest by any means I should appear to some to write or determine anything beyond the word of the New Covenant of the Gospel, which must not be added to nor diminished by him who has resolved to order his life according to the Gospel itself."¹

¹ Οὐκ ἀπορία του δύνασθαι ἐλεγχειν μὲν τὸ ψεῦδος, μαρτυρεῖν δὲ τὴ ἀληθείᾳ· δεδιὼς δὲ καὶ ἐξευλαβούμενος, μὴ πῃ δοξῶ τισιν ἐπισυνγράφειν ἡ ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι τῷ τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶνῆς διαθήκης λόγῳ· ὃ μῆτε προσθεῖναι μὴτ' ἀφελεῖν δυνατόν, τῷ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτὸ πολιτενεῖσθαι προσηγμένῳ. Asterius

How totally different this language to that of one who possessed another divine informant by the successional delivery of the oral teaching of the Apostles, and had in that tradition a full development of doctrines of which Scripture contained only "*notices*." And yet this is the language of one who lived only about a century after the times of the Apostles.

TERTULLIAN (fl. a. 192.)

Next in importance to the testimony of Irenæus is that of Tertullian, and their views on our present subject appear to be precisely the same.

In considering his testimony we shall follow the same course as in the case of Irenæus; we shall notice first those passages that support the view we have been maintaining upon the points under discussion, and then consider those which are likely to be referred to as adverse to it.

Is, then, Scripture the sole authoritative rule of faith with Tertullian?

The following passages will show how frequently it is referred to by him as the authoritative rule of faith, (not indeed under that name, because he uses that term more particularly for the creed established by the consent of the Apostolical Churches, but as being what that title signifies with us,) and we shall show hereafter what were the only exceptions he would have made against its being regarded as the *sole* authoritative rule of faith.

In his Treatise then, "*Against Hermogenes*," he distinctly calls it "*the rule of truth*;"¹ and elsewhere he says of a doctrine in question, "*Nothing is certain respecting it, because the Scripture does not declare it.*"²

Urbanus in *Fragm. op. adv. Montanist.* in Eusebii *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. c. 16. (Ed. Reading, vol. i. p. 228.)

¹ Veritatis regula prior quæ etiam futuras hæreses prænuntiavit, &c. TERTULLIAN. *adv. Hermog.* c. 1. Ed. Paris. 1664. fol. p. 233.

² Nihil de eo constat, quia Scriptura non exhibet. *Id.* *De carne Christi*, c. 6, p. 312. See also the immediately preceding context, "*Si non probant, quia nec scriptum est, nec, &c.*"

And in his Treatise "Against Praxeas," he says,—“You ought to prove this as clearly from the Scriptures as we prove that He made his Word his Son.”¹ And elsewhere he urges the refutation of error by “referring the points in dispute to the Scriptures of God.”²

Nay, in his Treatise “Against Hermogenes,” he says plainly, “That all things were made of some subjacent matter I have nowhere as yet read. Let the shop of Hermogenes show that it is *written*. If it is not written, let him fear that woe that is destined for those who add to or take from Scripture.”³ And so he says elsewhere. “Take from the heretics the principles they hold in common with the heathen, so that they may be left to *prove their points from the Scriptures alone*, and they will not be able to stand.”⁴

And hence in his Treatise “On præscription against the heretics,” he calls the Scriptures “*the documents of the doctrine [of religion]*.”⁵

And, in a word, throughout all his Treatises, with the few exceptions which shall be hereafter noted, he refers to the Scriptures alone for the proof of the doctrines of religion, and that, not as Mr. Newman does, who would have us suppose that it would be no proof unless tradition had delivered the doctrine, that is, in other words, that it is no proof at all, but as a real proof speaking to the common sense of every man.

¹ Probare autem tam aperte debebis ex Scripturis, quam nos probamus illum sibi filium fecisse sermonem suum. *Id.* Adv. Prax. c. 11. p. 505.

² Urgemur et communes sententias ab argumentationibus philosophorum liberare et communes argumentationes a sententiis eorum separare, *revocando quæstiones ad Dei literas*. *Id.* De anima, c. 2, p. 265.

³ *Id.* Adv. Hermog. c. 22. p. 241. The passage occurs in a following note.

⁴ Aufer denique hæreticis quæ cum ethnicis sapiunt, ut de Scripturis solis quæstiones suas sistant, et stare non poterunt. *Id.* De resurr. carn. c. 3. p. 327. That the arguments of the heretics from Scripture may be refuted from Scripture, he also intimates, *ib.* c. ult. p. 365. *Pristina instrumenta quasdam materias illis [i. e. hæresibus] videntur subministrasse, et ipsas quidem iisdem litteris revincibiles.*

⁵ *Id.* De Præscript. c. 38. The passage is given in a following note.

Moreover, that Scripture contains all the points of faith belonging to the Christian religion, we have these testimonies.

"I adore," he says, "*the fulness of Scripture* which manifests to me both the Creator and his works. But in the Gospel I find discourse very abundantly serving as the minister and witness of the Creator. But that all things were made of some subjacent matter I have nowhere as yet *read*. Let the shop of Hermogenes show that it is *written*. If it is *not written*, let him fear that woe that is destined for those who add to or take from Scripture."¹

This testimony is surely plain and distinct. The cavil of the Romanists that it applies only to one particular article is too absurd to need refutation. The latter part of the passage in particular is so utterly irreconcilable with such a notion, that no impartial reader could entertain it for a moment.

Again, in his Treatise "On præscription against the heretics," he says, speaking of the Church of Rome, "*She joins the Law and the Prophets with the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, and THENCE she draws the faith*;"² In those writings, then, "the faith" is to be found; and in another part of the same Treatise is a passage strongly, though indirectly, showing his mind in this

¹ Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, qua ["quæ alii teste Junio." Semler] mihi et factorem manifestat et facta. In evangelio vero amplius et ministerium atque arbitrium rectoris [factoris, MS. ap. Rigalt.] invenio sermonem. An autem de aliqua subjacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat vae illud adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum. Id. Adv. Hermog. c. 22. p. 241. See also his reference to Scripture in c. 23 of same Treatise, p. 245; and De carne Christi, c. 7. p. 312.

² Legem et prophetas cum Evangelicis et Apostolicis litteris miscet et inde potat fidem. Id. De Præscr. c. 36. p. 215. A passage implying the same occurs, according to the text of Pamelius, in c. 44 of this Treatise, "Si vero memores Dominicarum et Apostolicarum Scripturarum et denuntiationum in fide integra steterint, &c." The words "Scripturarum et" are omitted in the subsequent editions of Rigaltius and Priorius, and I think without notice.

matter. "The heretics," he says, "to show the ignorance of the Apostles bring forward the fact that Peter and they that were with him were blamed by Paul But we might here say to those who reject the Acts of the Apostles, you have first to show who that Paul was, both what before he was an Apostle, and how he was an Apostle . . . But they may believe forsooth *without the Scriptures*, that they may believe contrary to the Scriptures."¹

Having thus giving Tertullian's general view of the subject before us, I now proceed to consider what objections may be urged against it.

It may be urged, then, that the greater part of the works of Tertullian, and almost all those quoted above, were written after he had embraced Montanism, and believed that the effusions of Prisca and others were divinely-inspired, and therefore that he could not have looked upon the Scripture as the only divine informant.

This objection is so far valid that it must be admitted that Tertullian's reference to Scripture as the authoritative rule of faith must be supposed not to exclude the interpretations of Scripture given by Montanus and his prophetesses, which were received by Tertullian as proceeding from the Divine Spirit. But the admission must not be extended to any new points of doctrine, for such he did not believe to have been introduced by the "New Prophecy," but only improvements in the discipline of the Church. His view of the benefits accruing to the Church from the supposed inspiration of Montanus and his prophetesses is summarily expressed in the following sentence in his *Treatise on veiling virgins*, — "What, therefore, is the administration of the Paraclete but this,

¹ Proponunt ergo ad suggillandam ignorantiam aliquam Apostolorum, quod Petrus et qui cum eo reprehensi sint a Paulo . . . Possumus et hic Acta Apostolorum repudiantibus dicere, Prius est uti ostendatis quis iste Paulus, et quid ante Apostolum et quomodo Apostolus . . . Sed credant sine Scripturis ut credant adversus Scripturas. *Id. De Præscr. c. 23. p. 210. See also c. 8. p. 205.*

that discipline is directed, that the Scriptures are unfolded, that the understanding is improved, that an advance is made to better things.”¹

But, nevertheless, this did not prevent him, when reasoning with those who did not receive the “New Prophecy,” from making Scripture the authoritative rule of faith; and as far as regards any exception made by him in favour of Montanus and his prophetesses, as authoritative guides for the interpretation of that rule, so far, I suppose, it is needless here to offer any remark. Our opponents are not in this prepared to follow him. And, therefore, as far as this exception is concerned, his language is to us equivalent to the making Scripture the *sole* authoritative rule of faith.

But there remains certainly a limitation to be made to the general view of his sentiments given above as it respects certain prime points of the Christian faith which, like Irenæus, he speaks of as proveable *at that time* even independently of Scripture by the united testimony of all the Apostolical Churches. He thinks, and perhaps justly, considering the period at which he wrote, when the facts upon which he rested his view might be verified, that such a testimony established the apostolical origin of the truths to which it bore witness.²

These truths he has enumerated with some little variation in three of his Treatises,³ where he has given them under the title of “the rule of faith,” and in one of those Treatises, viz. that “Concerning præscription against the heretics,” he has distinctly stated that these truths may be proved to be of Apostolical origin by the unanimous consent of the Apostolical Churches, independently of Scripture, and that consequently any interpretation of Scrip-

¹ Quæ est ergo Paracleti administratio nisi hæc, quod disciplina dirigitur, quod Scripturæ revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur. *Id.* De virg. vel. c. i. p. 173, and see De resurr. c. ult. ad fin. p. 365.

Id. De Præscript. c. 21. p. 209.

³ De virg. vel. c. 1. p. 173. De Præscr. c. 13. pp. 206, 7. Adv. Prax. c. 2. p. 501. See these formulæ above, vol. i. pp. 114—116.

ture contrary to these must be false; and that since the heretics had corrupted the Scriptures, and that by allegation of the Scriptures the door was opened to much argumentation, foreign to the immediate subject, about the true text of Scripture and such points, it was better not to argue with them on these points from Scripture, but to allege at once against them the "rule of faith" supported by the unanimous consent of all the apostolical Churches.¹

But for more than the truths so enumerated, and which we have given in a preceding page,² he does not challenge the consent of the Apostolical Churches. Nay, he as much as intimates that more could not be so established, for he says, "while this form of faith remains in its proper place in your regard, however much you may seek and discuss matters, and pour out the whole excess of your curiosity, *if anything appears to you either to be doubtful or overshadowed with obscurity*, there is some brother, a doctor, gifted with the grace of knowledge, or some one conversant with those exercised in such matters, some one alike *curious* with yourself [who can advise you]; but while seeking alone, it is better for you to be ignorant to the last, lest you know what you ought not, because what is necessary you already know. 'Thy faith, saith he, hath saved thee;' not exercitation in the Scriptures."³ He does not, then, refer the inquirer on *other* points to the consentient testimony of the Churches, but advises the ordinary inquirer, if he be over curious in his researches into all the points treated of in the Scriptures, and finds something which appears to him doubtful or obscure, to

¹ De Præscr. cc. 15—21. pp. 207—9.

² See vol. i. pp. 114, 115.

³ Manente forma ejus in suo ordine, quantumlibet quæras et tractes, et omnem libidinem curiositatis effundas, si quid tibi videtur vel ambiguitate pendere vel obscuritate obumbrari, est utique frater aliqui doctor gratia scientiæ donatus, est aliqui inter exercitatos conversatus, aliqui tecum curiosus. Tecum tamen quærens, novissime ignorare melius est, ne quod non debeas noris, quia quod debeas nosti. Fides, inquit, tua te salvum fecit; non exercitatio Scripturarum. Id. De Præscr. c. 14. p. 207.

have recourse to some skilful teacher as a preservative against error; advice, of the prudence and propriety of which there can, I suppose, be no question, while it is equally unquestionable that such a teacher is not, nor is proposed by Tertullian as, an infallible guide.

Among other objections to this mode of arguing, the heretics urged that possibly the Churches might have put an erroneous sense upon the teaching of the Apostles, to which he justly replies, "Is it *likely* that such Churches and so many should have corrupted the faith precisely in the same way? No event where many individuals are concerned turns out precisely the same in the case of all. There would have been some difference in their doctrine had it been corrupted; that which is found the same among many is not a corruption, but what was delivered to them."¹

Let the reader observe that we meet with nothing here about episcopal grace preserving the pure deposit of the faith; nor even the more sober argument of Irenæus, that all the bishops might be enumerated from the times of the Apostles, and none accused of corrupting the faith.

And, further, he maintained that it was easy to show the *novelty* of the heresies he was combating, and consequently their error; and he calls upon the heretics, if they pretended to deduce their origin from the Apostles, to point out the succession through which their doctrine had come down to them, which was a very just challenge *at that time*.²

And, lastly, he, like Irenæus, uses this mode of argument against the heretics, on account apparently of the way in which they dealt with Scripture, corrupting it, and cavil-

¹ *Ecquid verisimile est, ut tot ac tantæ in unam fidem erraverint? Nullus inter multos eventus unus est. Exitus variasse debuerat error doctrinæ Ecclesiarum. Ceterum quod apud multos unum invenitur non est erratum sed traditum. Id. ib. c. 28. See cc. 27, 8. pp. 211, 12.*

² *Id. ib. cc. 29—32. pp. 212, 13.*

ling with the correctness of the text, and raising questions and arguments that prevented a fair appeal to Scripture.

This Treatise, viz. "Concerning præscription against the heretics," is, as far as Tertullian is concerned, the supposed stronghold of our opponents, for though he has spoken favourably of tradition in two other places, namely, in his Treatise "On the Crown," and that "Against Marcion," yet his notice of it in the former is only with respect to matters of discipline,¹ and in the latter consists of two passing allusions to it in a Treatise of five books, of which the whole argumentation is derived from Scripture, and these referring only to a point contained in the creed he has given as established by the consent of the Apostolical Churches, viz. a refutation of Marcion's idea that the God of the Old Testament was different to the God of the New.²

His argumentation elsewhere is derived wholly from the Scriptures, nor does he attempt to press his interpretations of Scripture upon the authority of tradition, except in the case already noticed, i. e. in the points contained in the creed he has given.

Now in all this it is difficult to see what support Tertullian gives to the views of our opponents. At the time he wrote he held that the agreement of all the Apostolical Churches in certain doctrines, to which agreement he appeals as *a fact that might be verified*, proved that those doctrines came from the Apostles; and, therefore, that the shortest way of dealing with the heretics of that day, (for he tells us himself that he used the argument "for the sake of brevity,"³) was by adducing this evidence against them. What then? Does it follow that Tertullian would pursue the same course now? Nay, this is not a question apparently, for we are not sent to

¹ Id. De Corona, cc. 3, 4. pp. 101, 102.

² Id. Adv. Marc. lib. i. c. 21 and lib. iii. c. i.

³ Solemus hæreticis compendii gratia de posteritate præscribere. Id. Adv. Hermog. c. 1. p. 233.

learn the truth thus, but from a few antient fallible authors. So, then, what is assumed must be, that, because Tertullian made such an appeal to the Apostolical Churches of his day, therefore he would now have appealed to a few fallible antient authors, as affording infallible proof of what was the universal opinion of all the Apostolical Churches sixteen centuries ago.

And after all, as we have already observed, how limited is the creed he gives as established by the consent of the Apostolical Churches. If our opponents were as moderate as he is in this respect, we should feel little inclined to disturb their position. But when in the nineteenth century they pretend to a knowledge of antient catholic consent, more extensive and minute than Tertullian pretended to in the second century, let them beware how they claim him as a supporter of their pretensions.

And as to any notion that the Creed of the Apostolical Churches, as given by Tertullian, adds anything to Scripture, it is directly opposed to Tertullian's views, for he is most careful to maintain its identity with the declarations of Scripture.¹

As Dr. Pusey, in the Tract to which we have referred in a former page,² has referred to the work of a learned living prelate of our Church, on Tertullian, I willingly join him in the appeal; and the reader will find it distinctly stated by that learned author that Tertullian held that "the Scriptures contained *the whole rule of faith*,"³ and that he agrees with Dr. Neander that, "though on some occasions the Christians of those days might appeal solely to the authority of tradition, they uniformly maintained that *the doctrine of Christianity* IN ALL ITS PARTS *might be deduced from Holy Writ*,"⁴ and that "though

¹ *Ib.* De Præscr. cc. 33, 34, and 38. pp. 214 and 216.

² See vol. i. p. 23 and 38.

³ The ecclesiastical history of the second and third centuries illustrated from the writings of Tertullian, by John, Bishop of Bristol. 2nd edit. 1826. p. 296.

⁴ *Ib.* Pref. pp. xvi., xvii.

interpretations which had received the sanction of the Church were not to be lightly rejected, yet the practice of Tertullian himself proves that *he believed every Christian to be at liberty to exercise his own judgment upon them.*"¹

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. (fl. a. 192.)

We now come to Clement of Alexandria, one of the most learned of the early Fathers whose remains are extant, but one whose works, valuable as they are, exhibit strong traces of feelings and habits of thought derived more from human philosophy than from divine revelation.²

In entering upon a review of his opinions on the subject before us, we have at once to remark his advocacy of a notion somewhat similar to that of our opponents, and which might by an incautious reader be confounded with it, but which nevertheless is far from being the same, and moreover is one almost *peculiar to himself*, of the Fathers yet extant. It was his opinion, then, as we learn from Eusebius, that "the Lord, after his resurrection, conferred the gift of knowledge upon James the Just, John and Peter, which they delivered to the rest of the Apostles, and those to the seventy disciples."³ And in the first Book of his Stromata, he says that the teachers from whom he had learned the Christian doctrine, "preserved the true tradition of the blessed Gospel as delivered by Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, the holy Apostles, having received it in succession the son from his father, though few are like the fathers; and at length, by God's help, are depositing with us those seeds received from their fore-

¹ Ib. pp. 296, 7.

² See especially the first book of his "Stromata."

³ 'Ο δε αὐτός [i. e. Κλημης] ἐν ἑβδόμῳ τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποθέσεως [i. e. Ὑποτυπώσεων], ἐτι καὶ ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ φησιν· Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Πέτρῳ· καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀναστάσιν παρέδωκε τὴν γνῶσιν ὁ Κύριος· οὗτοι τοῖς λοιποῖς Ἀποστόλοις παρέδωκαν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ Ἀποστολοὶ τοῖς ἑβδόμηκοντα. EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 1. (Ed. Col. 1612.)

fathers and the Apostles.”¹ A knowledge of this tradition he considers to be necessary to constitute a perfect Christian, whom he calls a Gnostic, distinguishing him from the ordinary Christian, whom he speaks of as having only common faith.²

This “Gnostic tradition,” however, as he frequently calls it,³ was not intended for Christians in general. The Lord, he tells us, “permitted the Divine mysteries and the holy light to be communicated to those who were capable of receiving them. He did not immediately reveal them to many, because they were not adapted to many, but to a few, to whom he knew them to be adapted, and who were both able to receive them and to be conformed to them. Secret things, like God, are entrusted to speech, not to writing.”⁴ And hence he exhorts the Gnostic, “Be cautious in the use of the word, lest any one who has fallen in with the knowledge taught by you, and is unable to receive the truth, should disobey and be ensnared by it; and to those who come without understanding, shut the fountain, whose waters are in the deep, but give drink to those who are athirst for truth. Conceal, therefore, this fountain from those who are not able to receive the profundity of the knowledge. The Gnostic, who is master of this fountain, will himself suffer punishment, if he gives occasion to one who as yet is only conversant with little things of taking offence, and of being

¹ ΑΛΛ' οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀληθὴ τῆς μακαρίας σωζόντες διδασκαλίας παραδοσιν, εὐθὺς ἀπὸ Πέτρου τε καὶ Ἰακώβου, Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Παύλου, τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, παῖς πατρὸς ἐκδεχομένος, ολίγοι δὲ οἱ πατρᾶσιν ὅμοιοι, ἦκον δὴ συνθεῶ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ προγονικά ἐκεῖνα καὶ Ἀποστολικά καταθήσομενοι σπέρματα. CLEM. ALEX. Strom. lib. i. pp. 322, 3. ed. Potter. Ox. 1715. (pp. 274, 5. edd. Par. 1641. and Col. 1688.)—See also Strom. lib. vi. p. 771, (or, 645.)

² See Strom. lib. v. pp. 659, 60, (or, 557, 8.)

³ ID. Strom. lib. iv. p. 564, (or, 475) and lib. v. p. 683, (or, 577), &c.

⁴ Μεταδιδόναι δὲ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου τοῦ ἁγίου τοῖς χωρεῖν δυναμένοις συγκεχωρήκεν [i. e. ὁ Κύριος]. Ἀντίκα οὐ πολλοῖς ἀπεκαλύψεν ἅ μὴ πολλῶν ἦν, ολίγοις δὲ οἷς προσηκεῖν ἠπιστάτο, τοῖς οἰοῖς τε ἐκδεξασθαι καὶ τυπωθῆναι πρὸς αὐτὰ τὰ δὲ ἀπορρητὰ, καθάπερ ὁ Θεὸς, λόγῳ πιστεύεται οὐ γραμμάτι. ID. Strom. lib. i. p. 323, (or, 275.)

swallowed up as it were by the greatness of his discourse, or if he transfers one who is only an operative to speculation, and leads him away by occasion of a momentary faith [which has no solid grounds in his mind to rest upon]."¹

Of this tradition Clement professes to give in his *Stromata* some account, though not of the whole of it, concealing some part intentionally, as too profound for common ears, and delivering the rest so that a common reader would not understand its full Gnostic sense,² and, moreover, acknowledging that some part of what had been delivered to him had escaped his recollection, not being committed to writing, and other parts partially obliterated by the lapse of time, a tolerably good proof of the insufficiency of oral tradition for the conveyance of truth. But we will quote his own words.

After stating that he is about to deliver the tradition which he had been taught by his Christian instructors, he adds,—“But I well know that many things have escaped us, having by the length of time fallen from my recollection, being unwritten, whence, in order to assist the weakness of my memory, and supply myself with a systematic exposition of the principal points, as a useful record for keeping them in remembrance, I have found it necessary to use this delineation of them. There are indeed some things which I do not recollect, for there was in those blessed men great power. And there are

¹ ἵνα οὖν μη τις τούτων ἐμπεσῶν εἰς τὴν ὑπο σου διδασκομένην γνῶσιν, ἀκρατῆς γενομένος τῆς ἀληθείας, παρακουσῇ τε καὶ παραπέσῃ, ἀσφαλῆς, φησί, περὶ τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ λόγου γίνου· καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀλόγως προσιοῦντας, ἀποκλείει τὴν ζῶσαν ἐν βαθειᾷ πηγῇ· ποτὶν δὲ οὐ γὰρ τοῖς ἀληθείας δειψήκοσιν. Ἐπικρυπτομένους δ' οὖν πρὸς τοὺς οὐχ οἴους τε οὐκ ἀπαρδεξασθαι τὸ βάθος τῆς γνῶσεως κατακαλύπτει τὸν λακκόν. Ὁ κύριος οὖν τοῦ λακκού, ὁ γνωστικός, αὐτὸς ζῆμιωθήσεται, φησί, τὴν αἰτίαν ὑπέχων τοῦ σκανδαλισθέντος, ἥτοι καταποθέντος τῷ μεγεθεῖ τοῦ λόγου, μικρολογου ἐπὶ οὐκ ὄντος· ἢ μετακινήσας τὸν ἐργάτην ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν, καὶ ἀποστήσας διὰ προφασέως τῆς αὐτοσχεδίου πίστεως. *Id. Strom. lib. v. p. 678, (or, 573.)*

² *Id. Strom. lib. i. pp. 323, 4 (or, 275); and lib. vii. p. 901 (or, 766); and see lib. i. p. 326, (or, 278.)*

some things which remained unnoted for some time, and which have now escaped me; and some things are nearly obliterated from my memory, perishing in my own mind, since such a service is not easy to those who are not experienced. But reviving the recollection of these things in my writings, I purposely omit some things, making a prudent choice, fearing to write what I even speak with caution and reserve; not in the spirit of envy, for that would be unjust, but fearing for my readers, lest by any means they should otherwise be made to fall, and we should be found putting, as those who speak in proverbs say, a sword into the hands of a child.”¹

Now certainly our opponents have here a patron not only of oral tradition, but also of “reserve in the communication of religious knowledge,” but unfortunately for their cause not the sort of tradition for which they are contending. The notion of this Gnostic tradition delivered only by our Lord to three or four of the Apostles, and disclosing certain hidden meanings of the truths and doctrines of Christianity not intended for Christians in general, is one of which Clement is, of those whose writings remain to us, almost the only supporter.

Nay, his statements on this point are directly opposed to those of Irenæus and Tertullian, who both inveigh strongly against any such notion. The former speaks of it as a tenet of the Carpocratian heretics, who, he tells us, “said that Jesus spoke some things privately in a mysterious manner to his disciples and Apostles, and com-

¹ Πολλα δε, ευ οίδα, παρερρηκεν ημας χρονου μηκει αγραφως διαπεσοντα. ‘Οθεν το ασθενες της μνημης της εμης επικουφίζων, κεφαλαιων συστηματικην εκθεσιν, μνημης υπομνημα σωτηριον πορίζων εμαυτω, αναγκαιως κεχρημαι τηδε τη υποτυπωσει. Εστι μεν ουν τινα μηδε απομνημονευθεντα ημιν’ πολλη γαρ η παρα τοις μακαριοις δυναμις ην ανδρασιν’ εστι δε και ανηποσημειωτα μεμνηκοτα τω χρονω’ α νυν απεδρα’ τα δε, οσα εσβεννυτο, εν αυτη μαραινομενα τη διανοια, επει μη ραδιος η τοιαδε διακονια τοις μη δεδοκιμασμενοις, ταυτα δε αναξωπυρων υπομνημασι, τα μεν εκων παραπεμπομαι, εκλεγων επιστημονως, φοβουμενος γραφειν, α και λεγειν εφυλαξαμην’ ου τι που φθονων ου γαρ θεμις’ dediwς δε αρα περι των εντυγχανοντων, μη πη ετερως σφαλειεν, και παιδι μαχαιραν, η φασιν οι παροιμαζομενοι, ορεγοντες ευρεθωμεν. Id. Strom. lib. i. p. 324, (or, 276.)

manded them to deliver those things to those that were worthy and obedient.”¹ And he says, “That Paul taught *plainly* what he knew not only to his companions but to *all who heard him*, he himself manifests. For in Miletus the bishops and presbyters being assembled, . . . he says, ‘I have not shunned to declare to you the whole counsel of God.’ Thus the Apostles *plainly* and willingly delivered to *all* those things which they had themselves learned from the Lord.”² And again, he says, “The doctrine of the Apostles is *manifest*, and firm, and *conceals nothing*, and is not that of men who teach one thing in secret and another openly. For this is the contrivance of counterfeits, and seducers, and hypocrites, as the Valentinians do.”³

And thus Tertullian;—“All the sayings of the Lord are proposed to all.”⁴ And he accuses those of “*madness*” who “think that the Apostles *did not reveal all things to all*, but that they *committed some things openly to all, without exception, and some secretly to a few.*”⁵

Most justly, therefore, is this notion of Clement, as to a secret tradition reserved for a few, pronounced by a learned

¹ Ἐν δὲ τοῖς συγγραμμασὶν αὐτῶν οὕτως ἀναγεγραπταί, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτως ἐξηγούνται, τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγοντες ἐν μυστηρίῳ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἀποστόλοις κατ’ ἰδίαν λελαλῆκεναι, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀξίωσαι, τοῖς ἀξίοις καὶ τοῖς πειθομένοις τὰντα παραδίδοναι. IREN. adv. Hær. lib. i. c. 24. (ed. Grabe.)

² Quoniam autem Paulus simpliciter quæ sciebat hæc et docebat, non solum eos qui cum eo erant, verum omnes audientes se, ipse facit manifestum. In Mileto enim convocatis Episcopis et Presbyteris . . . ‘Non subtraxi, inquit, uti non annunciarer omnem sententiam Dei vobis.’ Sic Apostoli simpliciter et nemini invidentes quæ didicerant ipsi a Domino hæc omnibus tradebant. ID. lib. iii. c. 14.

³ Doctrina Apostolorum manifesta et firma et nihil subtrahens, neque alia quidem in abscondito alia vero in manifesto docentium. Hoc enim fictorum et prave seducentium et hypocritarum est molimen, quemadmodum faciunt hi qui a Valentino sunt. ID. ib. c. 15.

⁴ Omnia quidem dicta Domini omnibus posita sunt. TERTULL. De Præscript. adv. hæret. c. 8. p. 205.

⁵ Eadem dementia est, cum confitentur quidem nihil Apostolos ignorasse, nec diversa inter se prædicasse, non tamen omnia volunt illos omnibus revelasse, quædam enim palam et universis, quædam secreto et paucis demandasse. TERTULL. De Præscript. adv. hæret. c. 25. p. 210.

prelate of our Church, who is referred to with approbation by our opponents, to be “destitute of solid foundation.”¹

And the reserve recommended, is a reserve only in communicating this Gnostic tradition, not in preaching the great doctrines of Christianity; and one which even to this limited extent is entirely opposed, as we have shown, to the views of Irenæus and Tertullian.

At any rate, as this Gnostic tradition is confessedly delivered by Clement so that the uninitiated cannot avail themselves of it, his writings will not serve to show us its true nature; and unless our opponents can lay claim to the possession of the key which unlocks this treasure, his tradition, and his notions respecting it, are to us equally useless and inapplicable. The knowledge of the profundities of this mystic tradition is gone, and with it the applicability to any practical purpose of all that is said respecting it.

But, with this exception, he speaks agreeably to the view we have been attempting to establish, as I shall now proceed to show. For,

First, he acknowledges no divine informant but Scripture, and this supposed Gnostic tradition.

Secondly, with respect to the claims of Scripture, as the rule of faith, he speaks thus.

“He, therefore,” he says, “who believes the divine Scriptures with a firm conviction, receives an incontrovertible demonstration, namely, the voice of God, who gave the Scriptures.”²

Again; “But the just shall live by faith; *that faith, namely, which is according to the Testament and the commandments*; since these [Testaments], which are two as it respects name and time, having been given, by a wise

¹ Bishop of Lincoln's Account of the writings and opinions of Clement of Alexandria, ch. 8. p. 368.

² Ὁ πιστεύσας τοίνυν ταῖς Γραφαῖς ταῖς θεαῖς, τὴν κρίσιν βεβαίαν ἔχων, ἀποδείξιν ἀναντιρρήτον, τὴν τοῦ τὰς Γραφῶν δεδωρημένου φωτὸς λαμβάνει Θεοῦ. Id. Strom. lib. ii. p. 433 (or, 362).

oeconomy, according to age and proficiency, are one in effect. Both the old and the new were given by one God, through the Son.”¹

Again; “But, since a happy life is set before us by the commandments, it behoves us all to follow it, not disobeying anything that is said, nor lightly esteeming what is becoming, though of the most trifling nature, but following whithersoever the word may lead; if we err from it, we must necessarily fall into endless evil. But they *who follow the divine Scripture, by which believers walk*, that they may become, as far as they can, like the Lord, ought not to live carelessly, but, &c.”²

Again, he tells us, that for those who, “for the benefit of their neighbours, betake themselves, some to writing, and others to the oral delivery of the word, while learning of another kind is *useful*, the perusal of the Dominical Scriptures is *necessary for the proof of what they say*.”³

And in the seventh book of his *Stromata*, replying to the objection of the heathen to Christianity, on the ground of its followers being divided into so many sects, he says,—“But when proof is being given, it is necessary to descend to the particular questions, and *to learn demonstratively, from the Scriptures themselves*, how, on the one hand, the sects were deceived, and how, on the other, both the most perfect knowledge, and that which is in

¹ Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζησεται, τῆς κατὰ τὴν Διαθήκην καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς· ἐπεὶ δὲ δύο αὐταὶ ὀνομασίᾳ καὶ χρόνῳ, καθ’ ἡλικίαν καὶ προκοπὴν οἰκονομικῶς δεδομένοι, δυνάμει μία οὐσαί· ἢ μὲν, παλαιὰ· ἢ δὲ, καινὴ, διὰ υἱοῦ παρ’ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ χορηγοῦνται. *Id. Strom. lib. ii. p. 444 (or, 372).*

² Ἐπεὶ δὲ βίος τις ἡμῖν μακάριος δι’ ἐντολῶν ἐπιδεδείκται, ὃ χρὴ πάντας ἐπομένους, μὴ παρακούοντας τῶν εἰρημένων τινος, μῆδὲ ολιγωρούντας τῶν προσήκοντων, καὶ ἐλαχιστον ἢ, ἐπεσθαι ἢ ἂν ὁ Λόγος ἡγῆται· εἰ σφαλεῖημεν αὐτοῦ, ἀθανάτω κακῷ περιπεσεῖν ἀναγκή· κατακολουθήσασι δὲ τῇ θεῷ Γραφῇ, δι’ ἧς ὀδεύουσιν οἱ πεπιστευκότες, ἐξομοιουσθαι κατὰ δυνάμιν τῷ Κυρίῳ, οὐκ ἀδιαφορῶς βιωτέον, ἀλλὰ κ. τ. λ. *Id. Strom. lib. iii. p. 530 (or, 443).*

³ Διὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν πέλας ὠφελείαν, τῶν μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ γράφειν ἱεμένων· τῶν δὲ, ἐπὶ τὸ παραδίδοναι στελλομένων τὸν λόγον· ἥτε ἄλλη παιδεία χρησίμος, ἥτε τῶν γραφῶν Κυριακῶν ἀναγνώσις εἰς ἀποδείξιν τῶν λεγομένων ἀναγκαῖα. *Id. Strom. lib. vi. p. 786 (or, 660).*

reality the best sect, are in the truth alone and the antient Church.”¹

Nor let it be supposed that by the words “the antient Church,” he says anything opposed to our view; for, by that phrase, he means the Church under the Apostles; as is evident, not only by the time when he wrote, but from his own words a little further on.²

Again, he says,—“They who are willing to labour for the acquisition of those things which are of the greatest excellence, *will not desist from their search for truth, before they have received a proof from the Scriptures themselves.*”³

And again,—“Thus, therefore, we, giving perfect proof respecting the Scriptures, from the Scriptures themselves, persuade through faith demonstratively.”⁴

“The truth,” he says, . . . “is found, by considering attentively what is perfectly proper and becoming for the Lord and the Almighty God, and by confirming each of the things demonstrated by the Scriptures from like Scriptures.”⁵

And a little further on his language clearly shows that

¹ Αποδείξεως δ' ούσης, ἀνάγκη συγκαταβαίνειν εἰς τὰς ζήτησεις, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν ἐκμανθάνειν ἀποδεικτικῶς, ὅπως μὲν ἀπεσφαλῇσαν αἱ αἵρεσεις, ὅπως δὲ ἐν μόνῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἦτε ἀκριβεστάτῃ γνῶσις, καὶ ἡ τῶν οὐτῶν ἀρίστη αἵρεσις. *Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 888 (or, 755).*

² *Id. Strom. lib. vii. pp. 898, 9 (or, 764, 5).*

³ Ἀλλ' οἱ ποτε ἔτοιμοι ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις, οὐ πρότερον ἀποστήσονται ζήτουντες τὴν ἀληθειαν, πρὶν ἂν τὴν ἀποδείξιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν λαβῶσι τῶν γραφῶν. *Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 889 (or 755).*

⁴ Οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν τελείως ἀποδεικνύντες ἐκ πίστεως πειθομένα ἀποδεικτικῶς. *Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 891 (or, 757).* See also the preceding context of this passage,—Τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῇ πιστοῦμεθα το ζήτουμενον ἢ πᾶσιν ἀποδείξεων ἐχεγγωτερα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡ μόνῃ ἀποδείξει οὐσα τυγχάνει. But as the meaning of the phrase Κυρίου φωνῇ is contested, I shall not here press this testimony; though I have the authority of the present Bishop of Lincoln (*Account of writings, &c. of Clement of Alexandria, p. 219*) for interpreting the phrase as meaning *the Scriptures*,—which renders the passage a remarkably strong testimony in our favour.

⁵ Ἡ ἀληθεια δὲ . . . εὐρίσκεται . . . ἐν τῷ διασκεψασθαι τι τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ παντοκράτορι Θεῷ τελείως οὐκ εἰς τε καὶ πρεπον· καὶ τῷ βεβαιῶν ἐκαστον τῶν ἀποδεικνυμένων κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν παλιν τῶν ὁμοίων γραφῶν. *Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 891 (or, 758).*

he appealed to the Scripture alone as the rule and judge of controversies, in disputing with those who differed from him, where he says,—“When we have overthrown them *by demonstrating that they are clearly opposed to the Scriptures*, you will see the leaders of the doctrine opposed, do one of two things; for either they give up the consequence of their own doctrines, or the prophecy itself, or rather their own hope.”¹

“They,” he says, “who do not follow God whithersoever he may lead them, fall away from that exalted state [which he has been describing]; and God leads *by the divinely-inspired Scriptures*.”²

From these passages, I think it is evident that the Holy Scriptures were proposed by Clement, as the authoritative rule of faith and judge of controversies for all Christians, and to all but his Gnostic Christian, the *sole* and *exclusive* rule and judge.

Unless, then, our opponents are willing to contend for his notions about a Gnostic tradition, delivered to four of the Apostles, and left as a deposit with certain rabbies of the Church for the benefit of a few mature Christians,³ they will derive no benefit from Clement’s testimony on this matter.

Moreover, notwithstanding his notions about a Gnostic tradition, it is evident that he considered it to be only an *exposition* of Scripture, and not as containing any additional doctrines or points of faith; for he says;—“We offer them that which cannot be contradicted, even that of which God is the author; and *of each one of those*

¹ Επειδαν γαρ ανατρεπωνται προς ἡμῶν δεικνυντων αυτοις σαφως εναντιουμενους ταις γραφαις, δυοιν θατερον ὑπο των προεστωτων του δογματος εστι θεασασθαι γινομενον· η γαρ της ακολουθιας των σφετερων δογματων, η της προφητειας αυτης, μαλλον δε της εαυτων ελπιδος καταφρονουσιν. Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 892 (or, 758).

² Αποπιπτουσιν αρα τουδε του νψους, οί μη επομενοι Θεω, εαν (η αν Potter) ἡγηται· ἡγεται δε κατὰ τας θεοπνευστους γραφας. Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 894 (or, 761).

³ See Strom. lib. vii. pp. 864, 5 (or, 731, 2).

*things which form the subject of our enquiries, he has taught us in the Scriptures.”*¹

And it is clear from many passages, that he considered the Gnostic tradition as only explanatory of Scripture, and not adding to it any new points of faith. Thus he says, when about to give a description of the Christian faith,—“ We shall bring testimonies from the Scriptures hereafter, in their proper places ; but we shall give what they deliver, and describe the Christian faith (or Christianity) in a summary way . . . and if what we say should appear to any of the vulgar contrary to the Dominical Scriptures, they must know that, from that source, they have their breath and life ; and taking their origin from them, profess to give the sense only, not the words.”²

So, also, he intimates elsewhere, that the Gnostic tradition delivered only things “ agreeable to the divinely-inspired oracles.”³ And that “ the Gnostic knows ancient things, and conjectures things to come, by the Scriptures.”⁴

Hence, he says, that “ they who have only tasted the Scriptures, are believers ; but they who have advanced further are perfect indexes of the truth, namely, the Gnostics, as, in things pertaining to this life, those who understand any art possess something more than the ignorant, and produce that which is superior to the ideas of the vulgar.”⁵

¹ Προτεινομεν γαρ αυτοις αναντιρρητον εκεινο, ο δ Θεος εστιν ο λεγων, και περι ενος εκαστου ων επιζητω παριστας εγγραφως. Id. Strom. lib. v. p. 646 (or, 547).

² Κατα τους επικαιρους τοπους υστερον ταις γραφαις συγχρησιμομενοι τα δ' εξ αυτων δηλουμενα σημανουμεν κεφαλαιωδως τον χριστιανισμον υπογραφοντες . . . και ετεροια τισι των πολλων καταφαινεται τα υφ' ημων λεγομενα των Κυριακων γραφων, ιστεον οτι εκειθεν αναπνει τε και ζη, και τας αφορμας απ' αυτων εχοντα, τον νουν μονον, ου την λεξιν παρισταν επαγγελλεται. Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 829 (or, 700).

³ Τα προσφηη τοις θεοπνευστοις λογοις υπο των μακαριων Αποστολων τε και διδασκαλων παραδιδομενα. Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 896, (or 762).

⁴ Ο γνωστικος γαρ οιδεν κατα την γραφην τα αρχαια και τα μελλοντα εικαζει. Id. Strom. lib. vi. p. 786 (or, 660). See also lib. vi. p. 802 (or, 676).

⁵ Οι μεν απογενεσασμενοι μονον των γραφων, πιστοι οι δε και προσωτερω χωρησαντες, ακριβεις γνωμονες της αληθειας υπαρχουσιν, οι γνωστικοι επει και τοις

It is evident, therefore, that, (as the learned prelate already quoted has observed,)—"The same Scriptures were placed in the hands of Clement's Gnostic, and of the common believer; but he interpreted them on different principles; he affixed to them a higher and more spiritual meaning. *The same doctrines were proposed as the objects of his faith*; but he explained them in a different manner; he discovered in them hidden meanings, which are not discernible by the vulgar eye."¹

HIPPOLYTUS THE MARTYR. (fl. a. 220.)

I pass on to a venerable and much-esteemed name, Hippolytus the Martyr, who thus bears his testimony on all the great points in question.

"There is one God, of whom, brethren, we have no knowledge, but from *the Holy Scriptures*. For as, if any one should wish to learn the wisdom of this world, he will not be able to obtain it otherwise than by reading the doctrines of the philosophers; in the same way as many of us as would *learn religion*, shall not be able to learn it anywhere else than *from the oracles of God*. Whatsoever, therefore, the divine writings proclaim, let us observe; and whatsoever they teach, let us make ourselves acquainted with; and let us believe in the Father, as the Father wills to be believed in; and let us glorify the Son, as he wills that the Son should be glorified; and let us receive the Holy Spirit, as he wills that the Holy Spirit should be given. Not [viewing these things] according to our own preconceived prejudices, nor according to our own notions, nor putting a forced construction upon what God has delivered, but according to the form in which he purposed to exhibit [the truth] by the Holy Scriptures, thus let us view it."²

κατα τον βιον εχουσι τι πλεον οι τεχνιται των ιδιωτων, και παρα τας κοινας εννοιαις εκτυπουσι το βελτιον. Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 891 (or, 757).

¹ Bp. of Lincoln's Account, &c. of Clem. of Alex. pp. 367, 8.

² 'Εἰς Θεός, ὃν οὐκ ἀλλοθεν ἐπιγινώσκομεν, ἀδελφοί, ἡ [ἐκ] τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν. 'Ὅν γὰρ τροπὸν εἰς τὴν βουλήν τῆς σοφίας τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἰσκέειν, οὐκ ἄλλως δυνήσεται τούτου τυχεῖν, εἰ μὴ δογμασὶ φιλοσοφῶν ἐντυχῇ, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τροπὸν

ORIGEN. (fl. a. 230.)

Our next witness shall be Origen. And nothing can be more to the point, than the passage we have quoted from him above, in illustration of another question, where he says,—“To me it seems good to cleave close, as to God and our Lord Jesus Christ, so also to his Apostles, *and to take my information from the divine Scriptures, according to their own tradition.*”¹

Again ;—“These two things are the works of a priest ; that he should either be *learning from God, by reading and frequently meditating upon the divine Scriptures*, or be teaching the people. But let him teach those things which he himself shall have *learnt from God*, not from his own heart, *or from the human understanding*, but *what the Holy Spirit teaches.*”²

“We must take the Scriptures as witnesses [to prove the truth of what we say]. For our doctrines and interpretations, without such witness, are not to be believed.”³

“If the oracles of God are in the Law and Prophets and Gospels and Apostles, it behoves him, who is a disciple of God, to reckon God his master for those oracles.”⁴

Speaking of our Saviour silencing the Sadducees by a

ἵσοι θεοσεβειαν ασκειν βουλομεθα, ουκ αλλοθεν ασκησμεν η εκ των λογίων του Θεου. Όσα τοιουν κηρυσσουν αι θειαι γραφαι, ιδωμεν, και ὅσα διδασκουσιν, επιγινωμεν, και ὡς θελει πατηρ πιστευεσθαι, πιστευσωμεν, και ὡς θελει υἱον δοξαζεσθαι, δοξασωμεν, και ὡς θελει πνευμα ἁγιον δωρεισθαι, λαβωμεν. Μη κατ' ιδιαν προαιρεσιν, μηδε κατ' ιδιον νουν, μηδε βιαζομενοι τα ὑπο του Θεου δεδομενα, αλλ' ὃν τροπον αὐτος ἐβουληθη δια των ἁγιων γραφων δεῖξαι, οὕτως ιδωμεν. HIPPOL. MART. Homil. contra Noet. §. 9. Ed. Fabric. 1716—1718, vol. ii. pp. 12, 13.

¹ See p. 257 above.

² Hæc duo sunt pontificis opera ; ut aut a Deo discat legendo Scripturas divinas, et sæpius meditando, aut populum doceat. Sed illa doceat, quæ ipse a Deo didicerit, non ex proprio corde, vel ex humano sensu, sed quæ Spiritus Sanctus docet. ORIGEN. In Levit. hom. 6. § 6. Tom. ii. p. 219. ed. Bened. Paris. 1733.

³ Μαρτυρας δεῖ λαβεῖν τας γραφας· αμαρτυροι γαρ αι επιβολαι ἡμων και αι εξηγησεις απιστοι εισιν. In Jerem. hom. 1. § 7. tom. iii. p. 129.

⁴ Εἰ Θεου λογια εστιν εν Νομῳ και Προφηταις Ευαγγελιῳις τε και Αποστολοις, δεησει τον μαθητευομενον Θεου λογιῳις διδασκαλον επιγραφεσθαι Θεον. In Jerem. hom. 10. *init.* (sec. Hieron. hom. 8.) tom. iii. p. 182.

reference to Scripture, he says,—“As our Saviour imposed silence on the Sadducees by the word of his doctrine, and confidently refuted the false dogma which they esteemed to be the truth, so will the followers of Christ also do by instances from the Scriptures, by which, according to sound doctrine, it behoves every voice of Pharaoh to be silent We ought to treat of those things that are not written according to the things that are written.”¹

Again;—St. Paul, “as is his custom, is desirous of confirming what he had said from the Holy Scriptures; and at the same time affords an example to the teachers of the Church, that in what they preach to the people they should bring forward not their own imaginations, but things that are supported by the divine testimonies.”² Similarly to what he says elsewhere, that “he is circumcised and clean who always speaks the word of God, and brings forward sound doctrine, supported by Evangelical and Apostolical admonitions.”³

“See,” he says, “how close they are upon danger who neglect to be versed in the divine Scriptures, *which alone* ought to direct our judgment in such an examination,” that is, as to who are true and who are false ministers of Christ.⁴

¹ Sicut Salvator verbo doctrinæ suæ silentium imposuit Sadducæis et falsum dogma quod apud illos veritas putabatur convicit fiducialiter, sic facient et Christi imitatores exemplis scripturarum, quibus oportet secundum sacram doctrinam omnem vocem obmutescere Pharaonis Secundum ea quæ scripta sunt tractare debemus, et ea quæ scripta non sunt. In Matt. Comment. Series § 1. (al. Tract. 23.) Tom. iii. p. 830.

² Ut ei moris est, de Scripturis sanctis vult affirmare quod dixerat: simul et doctoribus Ecclesiæ præbet exemplum, ut ea quæ loquuntur ad populum non propriis præsumpta sentiis, sed divinis munita testimoniis proferant. In Epist. ad Rom. lib. iii. § 2. Tom. iv. p. 504.

³ Circumcensus et mundus est, qui semper verbum Dei loquitur et sacram doctrinam Evangelicis et Apostolicis munitam regulis profert. In Genes. hom. iii. § 5. Tom. ii. p. 69.

⁴ Unde vide quam proximi periculo fiant hi qui exerceri in divinis literis negligunt, ex quibus solis hujusmodi examinationis agnoscenda discretio est. In Ep. ad Rom. lib. x. § 35. Tom. iv. p. 684. And he says elsewhere,—Divinare magis est quam explanare ubi quod dicitur non de Scripturarum auctoritate munitur. In Exod. hom. xiii. § 2. Tom. ii. p. 176.

A very remarkable testimony this as it respects other points in the present controversy, besides that immediately before us. For we here see that the Scriptures are considered by Origen as the proper test of orthodoxy and the true Church. And hence we see what is meant by those passages that are often triumphantly adduced in defence of pseudo-catholic views, such for instance as the following,—“It is a capital sin,” says Origen, “to think otherwise of the divine doctrines than the faith of the Church contains.”¹ No doubt it is; but it is not here intended that the dictum of any certain body of men should be laid down as *the ground* upon which our faith is to rest. It is true in the mouth of all parties, that he who in fundamental points does not hold the faith of the true Church of Christ is in fundamental error. But before we can make the creed of that Church the ground of our faith, we must determine infallibly who constitute that Church, and one of the necessary evidences by which we must discern that Church, is its holding the orthodox faith, which therefore must be determined before we can discover that Church. And when we consider these words in connexion with him who uttered them, we shall see most forcibly how little practical meaning they have. For what sort of exposition would Origen have given of the doctrines of the Church? An exposition unsound even in the highest points, and full (as Jerome will tell us²) of his own vagaries.

Further, Holy Scripture is with him the complete Rule of faith. For commenting on Lev. vii. 17, 18, on the words that the sacrifice was to be eaten within two days, and that if any remained to the third day it was to be burnt, he says;—“By these two days I think that the two Testaments may be understood, in which every word which belongs to God (for this is the sacrifice) may be sought and discovered, and a knowledge of all things ob-

¹ Capitis peccatum est, aliter quam fides Ecclesiæ continet de divinis sentire dogmatibus. In Levit. hom. viii. § 11. Tom. ii. p. 235.

² See vol. i. p. 228, *note*, and 232.

tained from them. *But if anything shall remain which the Divine Scripture does not determine, no other third scripture must be taken as an authority for our information*, because this is called the third day, but we must put into the fire what remains, that is, we must *leave it with God*. For God does not intend that in the present life we should know all things Lest, therefore, our sacrifice should not be accepted, and this very thing, namely, that we desire to inform ourselves from the divine Scriptures, become to us a cause of sin, let us keep ourselves within those limits which the spiritual law announces to us by the legislator.”¹ Absurdly fanciful as this interpretation is, it shows most forcibly Origen’s views upon the point now in question.

. Again ;—“ Therefore in proof of all the words we utter when teaching, we ought to produce the doctrine of Scripture as confirming the doctrine we utter. For as all the gold that is without the temple is not sanctified, so every doctrine that is not in the divine Scripture, although it may seem admirable to some, is not sacred, because it is not contained by the doctrine of Scripture, which sanctifies that doctrine alone which it contains within itself as the temple [renders sacred] the gold that is in it. We ought not, therefore, for the confirmation of our instructions, to swear by and take as evidence our own notions, which we individually hold, and think to be agreeable to truth, unless we are able to show that they are sacred, as being contained in the divine Scriptures as in some temples of God.”²

¹ In hoc biduo puto duo Testamenta posse intelligi in quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet, (hoc enim est sacrificium,) requiri et discuti, atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam scripturam debere ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi, quia hæc dies tertia nominatur, sed igni tradamus quod superest, id est Deo reservemus. Neque enim in præsentī vita Deus scire nos omnia voluit . . . Ne forte ergo non fiat acceptum sacrificium nostrum, et hoc ipsum, quod ex divinis scripturis cupimus scientiam capere, vertatur nobis in peccatum, servemus eas mensuras quas nobis per legislatorem lex spiritalis enunciat. In Levit. hom. v. § 9. Tom. ii. p. 212.

² Debemus ergo ad testimonium omnium verborum quæ proferimus in doc-

And hence, when discussing the question concerning the guardian angels of children, when they were appointed to them, at their birth or baptism, he says, (if the antient Latin version may be trusted,)—"You see that he who would discuss both of them with caution, it is his duty to show which of them is true, and to adduce in proof Scripture-testimony agreeing with one of the two."¹

To the strong testimony given in favour of our position in the above passages, I know of no drawback except what may be supposed to arise from his language when delivering the creed of the Church already quoted from him in a previous page.² Of this creed he speaks as having been delivered by the Apostles, and "remaining up to that time in the Churches;" and says that "that alone was to be held as the truth which in no respect disagreed with the ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition."³ And elsewhere, arguing against the heresies of Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides, and others, he says,—“But we ought not to believe them, nor to depart from the original and ecclesiastical tradition, nor to believe otherwise than according to what the Churches of God have by succession delivered to us.”⁴

trina proferre sensum scripturæ quasi confirmantem quem exponimus sensum. Sicut enim omne aurum quod fuerit extra templum non est sanctificatum, sic omnis sensus qui fuerit extra divinam scripturam, quamvis admirabilis videatur quibusdam, non est sanctus, quia non continetur a sensu scripturæ, quæ solet eum solum sensum sanctificare quem habet in se sicut templum proprium aurum. Non ergo debemus ad confirmandam doctrinam nostram nostros proprios intellectus jurare et quasi testimonia assumere, quos unusquisque nostrum intelligit, et secundum veritatem existimat esse, ni ostenderit eos sanctos esse, ex eo quod in scripturis continentur divinis quasi in templis quibusdam Dei. In Matt. Comment. Series, § 18. (al. Tract. 23.) Tom. iii. p. 842.

¹ Vides quoniam qui caute utrumque discusserit, illius est affirmare utrum eorum sit verum, et ad testimonium proferre Scripturam uni ex duobus consentientem. In Matth. Tom. xiii. § 27. *sec. vet. interpret.* Tom. iii. p. 607.

² See vol. i. pp. 226—30.

³ Cum multi sint qui se putant sentire quæ Christi sunt et nonnulli eorum diversa a prioribus sentiant, servetur vero ecclesiastica prædicatio per successionis ordinem ab Apostolis tradita, et usque ad præsens in ecclesiis permanens: illa sola credenda est veritas, quæ in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditione. De princip. lib. i. Præf. § 2. Tom. i. p. 47.

⁴ Sed nos illis credere non debemus, nec exire a prima et ecclesiastica tra-

Now from these words it no doubt follows, that for the truth of the doctrines contained in that creed he considered that there was proof, independent of Scripture, in the consentient teaching of the Apostolical Churches.

But first let us consider, to what points this creed, for which the consent of the Apostolical Churches is challenged by Origen, extends. Hardly to one of the points in controversy in the present day. How, then, can the authority of Origen be now pleaded for a reference to "tradition" in proof of points for which he does not challenge the evidence of tradition in his own day? He professes to give in this creed the *whole* of that for which the consent of the Apostolical Churches could be claimed. We cannot, then, quote him as sanctioning an appeal to "tradition" on other points.

Moreover, he gives no intimation that these points are not all fully and clearly delivered in Scripture, but, on the contrary, his language in other places shows that he was altogether opposed to any such notion.

Further; his appeal is of a totally different nature to any that can be made now. His comparative proximity to the times of the Apostles, made his reference to the testimony then borne by the Apostolical Churches altogether different to a reference in the present day to the witness of the works accidentally remaining to us of a few antient authors. His statements, therefore, fall far short of affording any countenance to the theory of the Romanists or the Tractators. On the contrary, when taken as a whole, and viewed with reference to the present day, they will, I think, be considered by an impartial reader clearly to support the opposite view.

I cannot help adding, also, that whatever might be thought of such passages, an appeal to Origen in support of the views which we are here opposing, seems to me altogether a mistake. For, as we have already seen, he

makes this "tradition" to which he refers responsible for some of his own errors.¹ He is a clear instance, then, how easy it is for men to make great mistakes, and embrace serious errors, and at the same time claim "Church-tradition" in their favour.

DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA. (fl. a. 247.)

There is also a remarkable testimony to Scripture as the Rule of faith, in an extract given us by Eusebius, from the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria. Dionysius there gives us an account of his going into the province of the Arsinoitæ, and convening a meeting of the presbyters and others of those parts, to discuss the doctrines of the millenarians, to which many in those parts were attached. What, then, was the rule of judgment to this meeting? At that early period one might not have been surprised if some reference had been made to tradition. But we find nothing of the kind. On the contrary, we are told by Dionysius, *in praise* of the spirit and mode of proceeding of the assembly, that while they attempted to maintain, as far as they could, their own notions, they were not ashamed, when the argument went against them, to confess their error; "but, on the contrary, acting most conscientiously and sincerely, and with hearts laid open to God's view, fully received *those things that were established by proofs and testimonies of the Holy Scriptures.*"²

CYPRIAN. (fl. a. 248.)

I proceed to the venerable Cyprian, whose testimony is beyond exception in our favour, and remarkably strong.

In the celebrated contest between him and Stephen, bishop of Rome, respecting the rebaptization of those

¹ See vol. i. pp. 228, *note*, and 232. Also Hieron. Ep. ad Avit. ep. 124. ed. Vallars. Venet.

² ΑΛΛ' ευσυνειδητως και ανυποκριτως και ταις καρδιαις προς τον Θεον ηπλωμεναις, τα ταις υποδειξεισι και διδασκαλιαις των αγιων γραφων συνιστανομενα καταδεχομενοι. DIONYS. ALEX. in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. c. 24.

baptized by heretics, it was pleaded by Stephen that "tradition" was against it. To this Cyprian replies, "Let nothing new be introduced," says Stephen, 'but what is delivered [tradited] to us.' Whence is that tradition? Does it descend from Dominical and Evangelical testimony, or does it come from the commands and epistles of the Apostles? For God declares that those things are to be done that are *written* If, therefore, it is either commanded in the Gospel, or contained in the Epistles or Acts of the Apostles, that those who come from any heresy should not be baptized, but only hands be placed upon them for repentance, let that divine and holy tradition be observed But if there is but one baptism, which is among us, and is internal, and of the divine favour has been granted to the Church alone, what obstinacy and presumption is it to prefer a *human tradition* to the divine appointment, and not to perceive that God is indignant and angry as often as human tradition annuls and neglects the divine precepts Custom without truth is merely old error; wherefore, leaving the error, let us follow truth But it is reckoned a gain by pious and simple minds both to lay aside the error, and to find and search out the truth. For if we return to the head and original of the divine tradition, human error ceases If an aqueduct, which before flowed largely and in abundance, suddenly fails, do we not go to the fountain, that the reason of the failure may there be ascertained, whether the water is dried up through the exhaustion of the supply at the fountain-head, or whether flowing thence freely and fully it has failed in the middle of its course; that if it has been caused through the pipe being broken or porous, so that the water could not flow on in a continuous stream, the pipe may be repaired and made good, and the water collected may be supplied for the use and drink of the city, with the same fulness and perfection with which it rises from the fountain-head? And this it now becomes the priests of God to do, observing the divine precepts, so that

if the truth has in anything wavered, we may return to the Dominical original and the Evangelical and Apostolical tradition, and the tenour of our actions take its rise from thence whence their order and origin took their rise. For it is delivered to us that there is one God, and one Christ, and one hope, and one faith, and one Church, and one baptism [Eph. iv. 4—6.] ordained only in one Church; and whoever departs from this unity, he must necessarily be found among heretics; whom while he [i. e. Stephen] defends against the Church, he impugns the sacred mystery of the divine tradition.”¹

¹ “ ‘Nihil innovetur,’ inquit, ‘nisi quod traditum est.’ Unde est ista traditio? utrumne de Dominica et Evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt, Deus testatur . . . Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis aut Actibus continetur, ut a quacunque hæresi venientes non baptizentur, sed tantum manus illis imponatur in pœnitentiam, observetur divina hæc et sancta traditio Quod si . . . baptisma non nisi unum est, quod apud nos est, et intus est, et soli Ecclesiæ de divina dignatione concessum est, quæ ista obstinatio est, quæve præsumptio, humanam traditionem divinæ dispositioni antepondere, nec animadvertere, indignari et irasci Deum quotiens divina præcepta solvit et præterit humana traditio Consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est; propter quod relicto errore sequamur veritatem In compendio est autem apud religiosas et simplices mentes et errorem deponere et invenire atque eruere veritatem. Nam si ad divinæ traditionis caput et originem revertamur, cessat error humanus Si canalis aquam ducens, qui copiose prius et largiter profluebat, subito deficiat; nonne ad fontem pergitur, ut illic defectionis ratio noscatur, utrumne arescentibus venis in capite unda siccaverit; an vero integra inde et plena procurrens in medio itinere destiterit; ut si vitio interrupti aut bibuli canalis effectum est, quo minus aqua continua perseveranter ac jugiter flueret, refecto et confirmato canali, ad usum atque ad potum civitatis aqua collecta eadem ubertate atque integritate representetur, qua de fonte proficiscitur? Quod et nunc facere oportet Dei sacerdotes præcepta divina servantes, ut si in aliquo nutaverit et vacillaverit veritas, ad originem Dominicam et Evangelicam et Apostolicam traditionem revertamur, et inde surgat actus nostri ratio, unde et ordo et origo surrexit. Traditum est enim nobis quod sit unus Deus, et Christus unus, et una spes, et fides una, et una Ecclesia, et baptisma unum [Eph. iv. 4—6], non nisi in una Ecclesia constitutum, a qua unitate quisquis discesserit, cum hæreticis necesse est inveniatur; quos dum contra Ecclesiam vindicat, sacramentum divinæ traditionis impugnat.” CYPRIANI Epist. ad Pompeium contra epist. Stephani. (Op. ed. Fell. Oxon. 1682. Ep. 74. P. ii. pp. 211—16.) See, also, the Letter of Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, to Cyprian, in approbation of these statements of Cyprian, which follows this Letter of Cyprian in all the editions of his works.

Here, then, we clearly see, that, even in a matter of Church-order, Cyprian allows that only to be a *divine tradition* which is to be found in Scripture, and characterizes everything else as *human tradition*; thereby affirming in the strongest way the whole of that for which we are here contending against the Romanists and the Tractators. And if this was the case in the middle of the *third* century, how much more in the middle of the *nineteenth*! ¹ The testimony of Augustine is no doubt opposed to this, who, speaking of this matter, maintains, in opposition to Cyprian, that there are some points of *Church-order* which may properly be believed to have been constituted by the Apostles, which are not to be found in Scripture. ² But this, as far as Cyprian is concerned, only strengthens our cause, because it shows that we are under no mistake as to the views of Cyprian.

And the views advocated in the above passage are abundantly confirmed in other parts of his works.

Thus, in his Epistle to Cæcilius, on the question of using water only in the eucharist, he writes thus,—“ Although, dear brother, I am aware that most of the bishops that by divine favour have been set over the Lord’s churches in the whole world adhere to the directions of the Evangelical truth and Dominical tradition, and do not depart from that which our Master Christ both commanded and performed, to follow a human and upstart ordinance; yet since some either ignorantly or foolishly, when consecrating the Dominical cup, and ministering to the people, do not do that which Jesus Christ our Lord and God, the author and teacher of this sacrifice, did and taught, I have thought it both an act of piety and necessity to address this letter to you, that if

¹ The question referred to in the above passage of Cyprian is fully discussed, vol. i. pp. 330, &c.

² Consuetudo illa quæ opponebatur Cypriano ab eorum [i. e. Apostolorum] traditione exordium sumsisse credenda est, sicut sunt multa quæ universa tenet Ecclesia, et ob hoc ab Apostolis præcepta bene creduntur, quamquam scripta non reperiantur. AUGUSTIN. De bapt. contr. Donat. lib. v. c. 31. (Ed. Bened. vol. ix. col. 156.)

any one is still held by this error, he may, by seeing the light of truth, return to the root and original of *the Dominical tradition* . . . Taking the cup on the day of his passion, he blessed it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, ‘Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I shall drink new wine with you in the kingdom of my Father.’ Where we find that the cup which our Lord offered was mixed, and that it was wine which he called his blood. Whence it is evident that the blood of Christ is not offered, if there is no wine in the cup; nor is the Dominical sacrifice duly celebrated, unless our oblation and sacrifice correspond with the Passion. But how shall we drink new wine of the fruit of the vine with Christ in the kingdom of the Father, if, in the sacrifice of God the Father, and Christ, we do not offer wine, and do not mix the cup of the Lord according to *the Dominical tradition*? Also the blessed Apostle Paul, chosen and sent by the Lord, and appointed a preacher of the evangelical truth, delivers the same things in his Epistle, saying, “The Lord Jesus, in the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread,” &c. [quoting 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24.] But if it is ordered by the Lord, and the same thing is confirmed and delivered by his Apostle, that as often as we drink in commemoration of the Lord, we ought to do that which the Lord also did, we find that that which is commanded is not observed by us, unless we do the very same things which the Lord did, and depart not from the divine precept, mixing the cup of the Lord in the same way as he did If, in the sacrifice which Christ offered, Christ only is to be followed, it becomes us to follow, and do that which Christ did, and which he commanded to be done Wherefore if Christ only is to be attended to, *we ought not to regard what any of our predecessors thought was to be done, but what he who preceded all, namely Christ, first did.* For we must not follow the

custom of man, but the truth of God And concerning this, also, let us send letters to our colleagues, that *the Evangelical law and the Dominical tradition may be everywhere observed*, and a departure not be made from that which Christ both taught and did.”¹

Here, again, in a very similar case to the former, Cyprian refers to Scripture as the only authoritative guide in the matter. And there is nothing, perhaps, which more shows how much the Fathers have often been mis-

¹ Quamquam sciam, frater carissime, episcopos plurimos ecclesiis Dominicis in toto mundo divina dignatione præpositos Evangelicæ veritatis ac Dominicæ traditionis tenere rationem, nec ab eo quod Christus magister et præcepit et gessit, humana et novella institutione decedere; tamen quoniam quidam vel ignoranter vel simpliciter in calice Dominico sanctificando et plebi ministrando non hoc faciunt, quod Jesus Christus, Dominus et Deus noster, sacrificii hujus auctor et doctor, fecit et docuit; religiosum pariter ac necessarium duxi has ad vos literas facere, ut si quis in isto errore adhuc teneatur, veritatis luce perspecta ad radicem atque originem traditionis Dominicæ revertatur Calicem sub die passionis accipiens, benedixit, et dedit discipulis suis, dicens; ‘Bibite ex hoc omnes; hic est enim sanguis Novi Testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Dico vobis, non bibam à modo ex ista creatura vitis usque in diem illum quo vobiscum bibam novum vinum in regno Patris mei.’ Qua in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, et vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit. Unde apparet sanguinem Christi non offerri, si desit vinum calici; nec sacrificium Dominicum legitima sanctificatione celebrari, nisi oblatio et sacrificium nostrum responderit passioni. Quomodo autem de creatura vitis novum vinum cum Christo in regno Patris bibemus, si in sacrificio Dei Patris et Christi vinum non offerimus, nec calicem Domini Dominica traditione miscemus? Beatus quoque Apostolus Paulus a Domino electus et missus, et prædicator veritatis Evangelicæ constitutus, hæc eadem in Epistola sua ponit, dicens; ‘Dominus Jesus, in qua nocte tradebatur, accepit panem,’ &c. [1 Cor. xi. 23, 24.] Quod si et a Domino præcipitur, et ab Apostolo ejus hoc idem confirmatur et traditur, ut quotiescumque biberimus in commemorationem Domini hoc faciamus, quod fecit et Dominus, invenimus non observari a nobis quod mandatum est, nisi eadem quæ Dominus fecit nos quoque faciamus, et calicem Domini pari ratione miscentes a divino magisterio non recedamus Si in sacrificio quod Christus obtulerit, non nisi Christus sequendus est, utique id nos obaudire et facere oportet, quod Christus fecit, et quod faciendum esse mandavit . . . Quare si solus Christus audiendus est, non debemus attendere, quid alius ante nos faciendum putaverit, sed quid qui ante omnes est Christus prior fecerit. Neque enim hominis consuetudinem sequi oportet, sed Dei veritatem . . . Et de hoc quoque ad collegas nostros literas dirigamus, ut ubique lex Evangelica et traditio Dominica servetur, et ab eo quod Christus et docuit et fecit non recedatur. CYPRIANI Epist. ad Cæcilium. (Op. Ed. Fell. Oxon. 1682. Ep. 63. P. 2. pp. 148—57.)

represented by the Romanists, than the fact, that they have constantly availed themselves of the word "tradition" in this, and the preceding passage, to make men believe that Cyprian was a supporter of their views of patristical tradition. That it is a misrepresentation, and that the Romanists are in the habit of making it, is admitted by *Lumper* himself, who says,—“When catholic theologians endeavour to prove the existence of divine traditions from the holy Fathers, they quote, in proof of them, the following passages from St. Cyprian.” And he instances the learned Ceillier (*Hist. gener. des Auteurs. Tom. 2. p. 165 &c.*) “But,” he adds, “by the leave of that most learned man and others, I must say that neither in this, nor the preceding passages, do St. Cyprian’s words refer to divine traditions, distinct from holy Scripture. *Any one will easily be convinced of the truth of this my assertion, if he will only at his leisure read the whole of the letters quoted* CYPRIAN ACKNOWLEDGED NO OTHER TRADITION THAN WHAT IS CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES And the illustrious Ceillier is both mistaken, and leads others into error, when he asserts that St. Cyprian defends infant baptism, by the authority of tradition; since *the contrary is obvious*, from the letter of the holy bishop to Fidus, where he defends the baptism of infants by the clearest reasons, derived from holy Scripture, without making any mention of tradition.”¹

¹ Quando Theologi Catholici existentiam traditionum divinarum ex SS. Patribus probare conantur, sequentia ex S. Cypriano loca pro iisdem comprobandis adducunt Sed pace hujus doctissimi viri aliorumque dixerim, neque in hoc neque in præcedentibus locis S. Cyprianum de traditionibus divinis a Scriptura sacra distinctis sermonem habere. De hujus asserti mei veritate quilibet facile convincetur, si laudatas Epistolas per otium integre evolvere voluerit Nullam aliam traditionem agnoscebat Cyprianus quam quæ in Scripturis continetur. Fallitur autem et fallit Cl. Ceillierius dum asserit S. Cyprianum Pædobaptismum per traditionis auctoritatem defendisse; siquidem contrarium ad oculum patet ex Epistola sancti antistitis ad Fidum in ordine Baluziano 59, ubi baptisma infantium præclarissimis rationum momentis e Scriptura sacra depromtis nulla traditionis facta mentione defendit. LUMPER *Hist. Theol.—Crit. de vita, &c. Patrum. Aug. Vind. 1785 &c. vol. xi. pp. 521—3.*

Such is the testimony of one who was himself a Romanist, after which I think there can be no doubt what are the views supported by Cyprian.

As connected, however, with our present subject, I would commend the following passages to the attention of the reader.

"That they may understand from you, and be instructed, and learn what ecclesiastical discipline demands, *according to the dictates of the Scriptures.*"¹

"This happens, dear brethren, in consequence of a return not being made to the source of the truth, and the fountain-head not being sought, nor the doctrine of our heavenly master being adhered to. Which if any one considers and examines, there will be no need of a long discussion and arguments."²

"Wherefore we also holding a middle course, and contemplating *the Lord's balance*, and meditating on the mercy and compassion of God the Father, after much and long discussion with each other, held a steady course between extremes in determining what was to be done."³

"We came together, and *after the Scriptures had been cited for a long time on both sides*, we, with a happy moderation, determined upon a middle course."⁴

"I have received your letters, dear brother, which are truly sensible and full of integrity and faith. Nor am I

¹ Ut sciant ex vobis et instruantur et discant, quid secundum Scripturarum magisterium ecclesiastica disciplina deponat. Ep. ad clerum de cura paup. &c. (Op. ed. Fell. Ep. 14. p. 32.)

² Hoc eo fit, fratres dilectissimi, dum ad veritatis originem non reditur, nec caput quæritur, nec magistri cælestis doctrina servatur. Quæ si quis consideret et examinet, tractatu longo atque argumentis opus non est. De unit. Eccles. (Op. ed. Fell. Oxon. 1682. P. 1. p. 105.) On the fraudulent corruption of this Treatise by the Romanists see *James's Corruption of Scripture and Fathers. Part 2. init.*

³ Propter quod et nos temperamentum tenentes, et libram Domini contemplantes, et Dei Patris pietatem ac misericordiam cogitantes, diu multumque tractatu inter nos habito, justa moderamine agenda libravimus. Ep. ad Max. Presb. &c. (Op. ed. Fell. Ep. 54. P. 2. p. 100.)

⁴ In unum convenimus, et Scripturis diu ex utraque parte prolatis temperamentum salubri moderatione libravimus. Ep. ad Antonian. (Op. ed. Fell. Ep. 55. P. 2. p. 102.)

surprised that *being well versed and skilful in the Dominical Scriptures, you do all things prudently and advisedly.*"¹

LACTANTIUS (fl. a. 303.)

Proceeding to Lactantius, we are told that "the faith is contained in the divine Scriptures."²

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA (fl. a. 315.)

Our next witness is the learned Eusebius Pamphilus; who, though not apparently in all respects orthodox,³ may, I suppose, be considered a witness not to be despised on the question before us.

In his Letter to the people of his own Diocese concerning the Council of Nice, he thus speaks of the Anathema which that Council annexed to the Creed which it published;—"Moreover we considered the anathematism published by them at the end of the Creed to be unobjectionable, inasmuch as it prohibits the use of expressions not found in the Scriptures, through which has come nearly all the confusion and disturbance that has arisen in the Church. No part, therefore, of holy Scripture having used the phrase, 'out of nothing,' or 'there was a time when he was not,' or those which follow, it appeared improper to say or teach these things; to which, as appearing reasonable, we assented."⁴ Can anything

¹ Accepimus literas tuas, frater carissime, satis sobrias et integritatis ac fidei plenas. Nec miramur si exercitatus et in Scripturis Dominicis peritus caute omnia et consulte geras. Ep. ad. Caldon. (Op. ed. Fell. Ox. 1682. Ep. 25. P. 2. p. 50.)

² Quod quia ille [i. e. Cyprianus] non fecit, raptus eximia eruditione divinarum literarum, ut iis solis contentus esset *quibus fides constat*, accessi Deo inspirante ut ego facerem, &c. LACTANT. Div. Institut. lib. v. c. 4. (Cant. 1685. p. 243. Paris. 1748. vol. i. p. 372.)

³ Many of the antients, and some of the moderns, speak of him as a ring-leader among the Arians. This, however, is evidently unfair, as he expressly repudiated the statements of Arius as to the Son, though his notions on the subject do not appear to have been strictly orthodox. Du Pin and Cave, the latter particularly, will give full information on the point.

⁴ Καὶ τὸν ἀναθεματισμὸν δὲ τὸν μετὰ τὴν πίστιν πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐκτεθέντα ἀλυποὶ εἶναι ἡγήσαμεθα, διὰ τὸ ἀπειργεῖν ἀγραφοῖς χρῆσασθαι φωναῖς· διὸ σχεδὸν ἢ πᾶσα γεγὼνε συγχυσις τε καὶ ἀκαταστασία τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν μὴδεμίας γούν θεοπνευστοῦ

show more clearly how completely Scripture was made the sole authoritative rule of faith by Eusebius, and *as far as his testimony goes* by the Bishops at Nice? We shall hereafter see that the introduction of the word “consubstantial” into their Confession is not inconsistent with this decision, for that word was made use of *as one immediately* flowing from the language of Scripture, and only equivalent to that which was clearly expressed in Scripture.

Again; in the disputation with the Philosopher in the Council of Nice recorded by Gelasius, Eusebius replying in the name of the bishops there assembled, makes in one of his answers the following observations, — “Believe those things which are written, the things which are not written neither consider nor enquire after;” and shortly after, having expounded what he considered the true doctrine respecting the Son, he adds, “which we, knowing by faith, preach according to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.”²

Still more plainly in the Preface to his Oration in praise of the Emperor Constantine, in which he discourses at large respecting God and his providence, the incarnation of our Saviour, and the blessings we derive through him, he speaks of the Holy Scriptures as our great

γραφῆς το, ἐξ οὐκ οὐτῶν, καὶ το, ἣν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ τοῖς ἐξῆς ἐπιλεγόμενοις κεχρημένης, οὐκ εὐλογον ἐφ’ αὐτὰ λεγεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν. ὥ καὶ αὐτῷ καλῶς δοξάντι συνεθεμεθα. EUSEBII Epist. ad Cæsariens. in Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. 8. (Ed. Reading, vol. ii. p. 26.) See also Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. 12, et Gelas. Cyzic. Comment. Act. Conc. Nic. P. 2. c. 36. Ed. Balf. p. 185.

² Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πιστεῦε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ἐννοεῖ μηδὲ ζῆται ὅπερ ἡμεῖς πιστεῖ νοοῦντες κηρυττομέν, κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν. Euseb. ad. Philosoph. in Gelas. Cyzic. Comment. Act. Conc. Nic. P. 2. c. 19. Ed. Balf. p. 124. It is right that I should here add that some modern authors have doubted the authenticity of the statements made by Gelasius as to what took place in the Council of Nice, that is, those which rest upon his authority alone. The Romanists, in particular, find it convenient to call his statements in question. As to this particular passage, therefore, I leave the matter to the reader’s judgment. See respecting Gelasius, Miræi Auctarium De Scriptor. Eccles. p. 21. in Fabric. Biblioth. Eccles. Hamb. 1718. and Cave Hist. Liter.

Teacher in these points. "Let the declarations of the Oracles, not those uttered by divination or rather foolish madness, but those uttered by the light of divine inspiration, be our teachers in the sacred mysteries; [let them teach us] concerning the kingdom itself, and concerning the supreme King, and the divine Guard which surrounds the universal King; as also concerning that example of royalty which is among us, and concerning that which falsely counterfeits its character; and those things which accompany each rank. From these [oracles] therefore, having learnt the sacrifices suitable to God, as from some Hierophantæ, let us thus commence handling the divine mysteries."¹

THE COUNCIL OF NICE (a. 325.)

From Eusebius let us pass on to the consideration of the proceedings at the great Council of Nice, and see what is the testimony borne by the conduct of that assembly to the subject under discussion.

The Tractators with the Romanists would fain make us believe that the Fathers there assembled pronounced judgment not directly from Scripture, but from the interpretation given to Scripture by ecclesiastical tradition. Mr. Keble, in particular, has devoted many pages to the endeavour to prove that the Nicene Fathers were "earnest and constant in resorting to *tradition* in order to decide among conflicting interpretations of Scripture, and settle the fundamentals of our most holy faith," (p. 141,) and asserts that they "went to *church tradition* for the critical and decisive phrase 'of one substance with the Father,'" (p. 138,) all which I hope to prove is very far from the truth.

¹ Λογιων δε χρησμοι, ουκ εκ μαντειας μαλλον η μανιας παραφρονος, φωτος δ' επιπνοιας ενθεου προσπεφωνημενοι, των τελειων ημιν γενεσθωσαν διδασκαλοι αμφι βασιλειας αυτης· αμφι τε βασιλεως του ανωτατου· δορυφοριας τε θειας αμφι των παντων βασιλεα· του τε καθ' ημας βασιλικου παραδειγματος, και του το χαραγμα κεκιβδηλουμενου· των θ' εκατερω συνομαρτουνητων ταγματι. οἷς δη τας θεοπρεπεις τελετας ιεροφαντουμενοι, ωδεπη θειων οργων εφασωμεθα. Præf. ad Orat. in laud. Constant. (Ed. Reading, vol. i. p. 716.)

I shall now, then, first give the reader some extracts from the accounts remaining to us of the proceedings of this Council, and then offer a few observations on what appear to me the very incorrect and delusive statements of Mr. Keble.

After an address on the part of the bishops to the Emperor Constantine, the discussion was opened by a speech from Constantine to the assembly, at the close of which he makes the following remarks,—“It would be grievous,” he says, “yea, very grievous, our enemies being destroyed, and no one daring to oppose us, that we should wound one another, and afford pleasure and laughter to our adversaries. And especially when we are discussing *divine things, and have the teaching of the most holy Spirit fully committed to writing. For the evangelical and apostolical books, and the oracles of the antient prophets,* CLEARLY AND FULLY TEACH US *what should be our views respecting the Godhead. Let us, therefore, banish hostile contention, and* TAKE THE SOLUTION OF THE POINTS IN QUESTION FROM THE WORDS OF DIVINE INSPIRATION.”¹

Such were the sentiments of the Emperor Constantine, who was at that time not a novice in the Christian faith, and who had certainly had every advantage of instruction in it. A testimony more decisively in favour of the views for which we are contending could not have been pronounced, and whatever slight may have been put upon it by Bellarmine, in saying that Constantine was a great Emperor, but not a great doctor, or by Mr. Keble in passing it over *in silence*, there will be those who will regard it as

¹ Δεινον ειη και αγαν δεινον, των πολεμιων καταλυθεντων, και μηδεος αντι-τεινειν τολμωντος, αλληλους βαλλειν, και τοις δυσμενεσιν ηδουην και γελωτα προξενειν' αλλως τε και περι θειων διαλεγομενους πραγματων, και του παναγιου Πνευματος την διδασκαλιαν αναγρμπτον εχοντας. Ευαγγελικαι γαρ, φησι, βιβλοι και Αποστολικαι, και των παλαιων προφητων τα θεσπισματα, σαφως ημας α χρη περι του Θεου φρονειν εκπαιδευουσι. Την πολεμοποιον ουν υπελασαντες εριν, εκ των θεοπνευστων λογων λαβωμεν των ζητουμενων την λυσιν. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. 6. (Op. ed. Schulze Halæ, 1769 et seq. vol. iii. p. 757.) See also, Gelasii Cyzic. Comment. Act. Conc. Nic. lib. ii. c. 7. Ed. Balf. Lutet. 1599, pp. 84, 5.

evidence of something more than the mere private notion of an individual ; not to mention that it is stated by Theodoret that immediately upon the conclusion of this speech, “ the greater part of the synod assented to what he had said,”¹ and that the language in which he is spoken of by all who have written concerning him, point him out as no mean authority in the matter. I need hardly observe how completely this language proves that the Emperor Constantine recognised no other record of revelation or inspired *teaching* but the Holy Scriptures.

But further ; we are not without ample evidence of the way in which the discussion was conducted. It will be remembered that the points in question, and upon which the Council was called to decide, were those which had been mooted by Arius ; and of the conduct of the discussion on these points we have the following clear and particular account given us by Athanasius.

“ The assembled bishops being desirous to reject the impious phrases invented by the Arians, namely [that the Son was created] ‘ from things that were not,’ and the saying ‘ that the Son is a being created and made,’ and ‘ there was a time when he was not,’ and that ‘ he is of a changeable nature,’ and *to write words that were confessedly words of Scripture* ; namely, that the only-begotten Word is of God by nature, the Power, the alone Wisdom of the Father, the true God, as John said ; and as Paul has written, the brightness of the glory and the image of the Father’s substance ; the followers of Eusebius [of Nicomedia], being led astray by their own erroneous notions, said among themselves,—Let us assent to these things, for even we also are of God, for ‘ there is one God of whom are all things,’ and ‘ old things are passed away, behold all things are become new, but all things are of God.’ And they thought also of that which is written in ‘ The Shepherd,’ ‘ First of all believe that there is one God, who created and perfected all things, and brought them into

¹ Τῆς συνόδου το πλειστον τοις λεγομενοις επειθετο. Theodoret. *loc. loc.* p. 757.

existence out of nothing.' But the bishops seeing their deceitfulness and impious artfulness, used a plainer expression than 'of God,' and wrote, that the Son was 'of the substance of God;' so that creatures, from their not being produced from themselves without a cause, but having a beginning of their existence, might be said to be of God, but the Son only to be properly of the substance of the Father, for this is peculiar to the only-begotten and true Word with respect to the Father. *And this was the reason why those words were written 'of the substance.'* Again, the bishops asking those who appeared to be a small party, if they would say, that the Son was not a creature, but the Power, the alone Wisdom of the Father, and his eternal image, like to the Father in all things, and true God, the Eusebians were caught intimating to one another that these things also apply to us, for even we also are said to be the image and glory of God," &c. . . . " *But here also the bishops, having observed their deceit, collected together out of the Scriptures these words, the brightness, the fountain and the river, and the image of the substance, and that expression, 'In thy light shall we see light,' and that, 'I and my Father are one,' and then at last they wrote more plainly and compendiously, that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, for all the previous expressions have this meaning."*¹

¹ Των συνελθόντων επισκοπων βουλευμενων τις μεν παρα των Αρειανων εφευρεθεισας της ασεβειας λεξεις ανελιν' το, εξ ουκ οντων και το λεγειν κτισμα και ποιημα τον υιον' και, ην ποτε οτε ουκ ην' και οτι τρεπτης εστι φυσικως' τας δε των γραφων δημολογουμενας γραφαι' οτι τε εκ του Θεου τη φυσει μονογενης εστιν ο λογος, δυναμις, σοφια μονη του Πατρος, θεος αληθινος, ως ειπεν ο Ιωαννης' και ως εγραψεν ο Παυλος, απαγμασμα της δοξης, και χαρακτηρ της του Πατρος υποστασεως' οί περι Ευσεβιον υπο της ιδίας κακοδοξίας έλκομενοι, διελαουν αλληλοις' συνθωμεθα' και γαρ και ήμεις εκ του θεου εσμεν' εις γαρ θεος εξ ου τα παντα' και, τα αρχαια παρηλθεν, ιδου γεγνε τα παντα καινα' τα δε παντα εκ του θεου' ελογιζοντο δε και το εν τω Ποιμενι γραφεν' πρωτον παντων πιστευσον, οτι εις εστιν ο θεος, ο τα παντα κτισας και καταρτισας, και ποιησας εκ του μη οντος εις το ειναι. ΑΛΛ' οί επισκοποι θεωρησαντες την πανουργιαν εκεινων, και την της ασεβειας κακοτεχνιαν, λευκοτερον ειρηκασι το εκ του θεου, και εγραψεν, εκ της ουσιας του θεου ειναι τον υιον, ινα τα μεν κτισματα, δια το μη αφ' αυτων χωρις αιτιου ειναι αλλα αρχην εχειν του γενεσθαι, λεγεται εκ του θεου, ο δε υιος μονος ιδιος της του

This account is repeated by Athanasius in another place in almost the same words, the last sentence being, if possible, still more clear in favour of the cause being determined *directly* from Scripture. "But the bishops having observed their hypocrisy in this were compelled again to collect the sense of the matter *from the Scriptures*, and to repeat in plainer words what they had said before, and write that the Son was consubstantial with the Father." ¹

How, with this clear and particular account of the mode in which the discussion was conducted, any one can affirm that the matter was determined by a reference to the traditional interpretation of the Church, is almost inconceivable. And yet, in the face of these passages, Mr. Keble scruples not to affirm that "the three hundred bishops who joined in its [i. e. the Nicene Creed's] promulgation, did not profess to have collected it out of the Bible, but simply to express the faith which each of them had found in the Church which he represented, received by tradition from the Apostles." (p. 35.)! *And these passages, containing a plain and clear account of the way in which the discussion was conducted, though occurring in Treatises from which Mr. Keble has quoted, are passed*

Πατρος ουσίας· τούτο γὰρ ἰδίον μονογενούς καὶ ἀληθινου λόγου πρὸς Πατέρα. Καὶ περὶ μὲν τοῦ γεγραφθαι ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας, ἡ προφασὶς αὕτη. Πάλιν δὲ τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν ἐρωτῶντων τοὺς δοκουντας ὀλίγους, εἰπερ λεγοίεν, τὸν υἱὸν οὐ κτίσμα, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει, σοφίαν μόνην τοῦ Πατρος, καὶ εἰκόνα αἰδίου, ἀπαράλλακτον κατὰ πάντα τοῦ Πατρος, καὶ θεὸν ἀληθινόν, κατεληφθήσαν οἱ περὶ Εὐσεβίου διανέοντες ἀλλήλοις, ὅτι καὶ τὰντα φθάνει καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς, καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ λεγομεθα, κ. τ. λ., Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνταῦθα οἱ Ἐπισκοποὶ θεωρήσαντες ἐκείνων τὸ δόλιον, συνήγαγον ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν, τὸ ἀπαυγάσμα, τὴν τε πηγὴν καὶ τὸν ποταμόν, καὶ τὸν χαρακτῆρα πρὸς τὴν ὑπόστασιν, καὶ τὸ, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ σου ὀψομεθα φῶς, καὶ τὸ, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐσμέν· καὶ λευκότερον λοιπὸν καὶ συντομῶς ἐγράψαν, ὁμοουσίον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν υἱόν· τὰ γὰρ προεῖρημένα πάντα ταύτην ἔχει τὴν σημασίαν. ΑΘΑΝΑΣ. Ad Afros Episc. Epist. §§ 5, 6. Ed. Bened. tom. i. pp. 895, 6. This passage is quoted by Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. lib i. c. 7.

¹ ΑΛΛ' οἱ ἐπισκοποὶ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ θεωρήσαντες τὴν ὑποκρίσιν ἐκείνων, καὶ ὅτι κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ἐν καρδίαις τῶν ἀσεβῶν δόλος ἐστὶ τεκταινομένων κακῶν, ἠναγκάσθησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ αὐθὺς συναγαγεῖν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν τὴν διανοίαν, καὶ ἄπερ προτερον ἐλέγον, τὰντα πάλιν λευκότερον εἰπεῖν καὶ γράψαι, ὁμοουσίον εἶναι τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν υἱόν. De Decret. Synod. Nic. § 20. tom. i. pp. 225, 6.

over in complete silence; and his evidence as to the conduct of the debate is derived wholly from inferences drawn from indirect sources of information. The case is so important, that it may be worth while to sift that evidence, and it will afford an opportunity of strengthening the conclusions to which the preceding extracts necessarily lead.

The representation which Mr. Keble has given us of the matter is this; "The method of proceeding at Nicæa appears to have been nearly as follows; each bishop was required to rehearse the faith which he and his Church professed, and into which they were baptized," and when all, with but few exceptions, "agreed substantially in the orthodox interpretation," "the burthen of proof was of course thrown on the heresiarch, and he was required to make good his theory by allegations from Scripture," "but his allegations being overthrown by large arguments from Scripture itself, the orthodox creed was considered as sufficiently established," and "*the orthodox TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATION was incorporated into a written creed*, being first thoroughly vindicated both in the substance and wording of it, and also in the annexed anathema, by reasoning out of Holy Writ. The result was the Nicene Creed with its anathema." (pp. 119, 20.)

Now all this as to the bishops "rehearsing their faith," and this "*orthodox traditional interpretation*," in which they "agreed substantially," being "incorporated into a written creed," is *a pure fiction*, utterly destitute of any testimony in its favour in all the various accounts given us by *the antients* of this Council, and clearly opposed to the accounts quoted above of its proceedings. Not one of those who have left us an account of this Council, has given us the slightest hint that the bishops there assembled so gave in their confessions of faith; and Bishop Taylor, after saying, "it is not certain that they at their meeting recited any other creed than the Apostolical," adds, "for that they did not, Laurentius Valla, a Canon in the Lateran Church, affirms, that himself hath read in

the antient books of Isidore, who collected the canons of the antient councils." (x. 462.)

Further, as to the notion that these creeds, containing the "orthodox traditional interpretation," were incorporated, and thus formed the Nicene Creed, we have demonstrative evidence that it is incorrect, for Eusebius, in his Letter to his own Diocese, giving an account of the proceedings of the Council, gives us the creed which he proposed to the Council as that which he had received from the bishops who had preceded him and his early instructors, and had professed at baptism, and "learned from the Holy Scriptures," and which he tells us was *approved* (i. e. as far as it went) *by the bishops there assembled*, and in which those very phrases, which alone were obnoxious to the Arian party, and were controverted in the Council, were not to be found; and which is condemned by Athanasius as unsatisfactory on the points in question;¹ and by the extracts given above from Athanasius, we see clearly in what way, and by what considerations, the Council was induced to add to this proposed and approved creed of Eusebius the words which alone decisively condemned the heresy of Arius, and in which more particularly the Nicene Creed differs from the Apostolical, namely, by reasoning drawn directly from Scripture. Indeed it is obvious, that if the baptismal creeds of the Churches had contained a condemnation of the errors of Arius, there would have been no need of the Council of Nice. Nay, Mr. Keble himself tells us that "*additions*" were made at Nice to "the old baptismal creed." (pp. 137, 8.) How, then, can he say at the same time that the Nicene Creed is merely an incorporation of a number of different forms of "the old baptismal creed?" And further, the agreement of the bishops assembled at Nice respecting the doctrine there debated upon, is expressly attributed by Constantine to their being under the influence of the Holy Spirit.²

¹ See ATHANAS. De Decret. Synod. Nic. § 3. tom. i. pp. 210, 11.

² See SOCRAT. Hist. Eccl. i. 9.

Let us see, then, in what way Mr. Keble attempts to defend his view of the matter.

"First," he says, "there is the general presumption in favour of it." (p. 121.) A most extraordinary argument, surely, to begin with, in a matter which must rest upon testimony, and which bodes ill for what follows.

He then refers to the circular letter of Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, giving notice of his condemnation of Arius, and that which he wrote on the same subject to Alexander, Patriarch of Constantinople; and having given us two extracts, says, "Thus much may suffice to show the opinion of the venerable Alexander concerning the best way of dealing with the controversy which led to the Nicene Council." (p. 123.) But these extracts do anything but suffice to show this, for they would give the reader a very erroneous view of the matter. For the extract from the first letter is *merely* this,—“Who ever heard such things? or who now hearing them, is not astonished, and stoppeth his ears, that the contamination of these words may not touch his hearing?”

But Alexander *proceeds thus*,—"For who is there who, when he hears John saying, 'In the beginning was the word,' does not condemn these men, saying, 'There was a time when he was not'? Or who, hearing in the Gospel, 'the only-begotten Son,' and 'by him all things were made,' will not abhor these men when they declare that he is a creature?" And then having proceeded to adduce many other passages of Scripture in behalf of the orthodox faith, he adds,—“Saying these things, and *unfolding the divine Scriptures, we oftentimes overthrew them, and then, like chamæleons, they immediately changed their ground.*”¹ Now, “*thus much*” may “suffice to show the opinion of the venerable Alexander concerning the best way of dealing with the controversy,” and *that*

¹ Καὶ ταῦτα λεγόντες, καὶ ἀναπτύσσοντες τὰς θείας γραφάς, πολλὰκις ἀνέτρεψαμεν αὐτοὺς· καὶ πάλιν ὡς χαμαιλέοντες μετεβαλλόντο. Epist. ALEXANDRI ad fratres qui ubique gentium sunt, in SOCRAT. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 6. (al. 3.) p. 13, ed. Reading. and GELAS. CYZIC. lib. ii. c. 3. pp. 56, 7.

that opinion was, that it was to be decided by a reference to Scripture and Scripture only, for to that only does he refer. And so Theodoret says of him, that "he, following the divine oracles, said that the Son is equally to be honoured with the Father, and that he is of the same substance with the Father who begot him; but Arius, fighting against the truth, called him a being created and made."¹

With respect to the second letter,² I know not what advantage Mr. Keble can suppose his cause to gain by it, for he himself allows that the refutation contained in it of Arian errors is derived solely from Scripture. But, saith Mr. Keble, he concludes with "a distinct enunciation of his own and his Church's faith, conceived in such terms, and with such arrangement, as evidently show it to be a paraphrase on the baptismal or Apostolical creed then in use at Alexandria." (p. 123.) What then? May we not repeat the Apostolical or Nicene Creed, as containing our belief, without its being supposed that we accept them on the ground of the authority of ecclesiastical tradition, and not on the ground of *our belief* in their conformity to Scripture? Nay, the words of Alexander himself preclude all doubt as to his view of the subject, for he expressly refers the creed which he gives to the *teaching* of the Holy Scriptures. "Besides this religious opinion concerning the Father and Son, *as the Sacred Scriptures teach*, we confess one Holy Ghost," &c. The form of words in which he expressed his belief might be similar to that of many who lived before him; but the sole *authority* upon which he spoke was the testimony of Holy Scripture. So the orthodox Presbyters who opposed Noetus, after giving a statement of their faith almost in the words of the Apostles' Creed, add, "These are the

¹ Καὶ ὁ μὲν [i. e. Ἀλεξάνδρος] τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις ἐπομενος, ἡμοτιμον ἐλεγε τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν εἶναι τῷ γεγεννημένῳ. Θεῷ δὲ δε Ἀρείου ἀντικρὺς τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μαχομένος, κτῖσμα καὶ ποιῆμα προσήγορεν. THEOD. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 1. Ed. ead. p. 726.

² See THEOD. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 3.

doctrines we profess, *having LEARNT them from the divine Scriptures.*"¹

His next reference is to Athanasius, to whom he refers as supporting the position that we are to go to tradition as our authoritative teacher as to what is the faith, and then find, as we may, the proof in Scripture, and hence deduces the inference that the Council of Nice, in which Athanasius took so prominent a part, must have also acted upon this principle. This *inference* we might fairly leave to its fate, after the quotations given above respecting the actual proceedings of the Council; but I will just observe, that the only two passages quoted from Athanasius, which would seem to prove that such was his view, are the two upon which we have already commented in a preceding chapter, to which therefore I refer the reader.²

"Proceeding," says Mr. Keble, "to the few details which remain of what took place in the Council, we find nothing to contradict, and much to strengthen the idea, that not only St. Athanasius's doctrine, but also his mode of establishing it, was there sanctioned." Here, then, we might fairly expect some notice of the passages we have given above from Athanasius, *describing* "what took place in the Council." But to these *not the most remote allusion is made*, and we hear of nothing but some circumstances and remarks incidental to the discussion, which prove nothing. The first is an observation of Sozomen relating to what took place at a meeting of the bishops a few days before the Council was opened. "Some," he says, "were for discouraging all innovation on the faith delivered down from the beginning; those especially whose simplicity of character taught them, without nice inquiry, to accept the faith in God. Others were peremptory, that it was wrong, without trial, to follow after the

¹ Ταῦτα λεγόμενα μεμαθηκότες ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν, ἃ καὶ ἐπιστάμεθα. See EPIPHAN. Adv. hæ. in hæ. 57, § 1. Ed. Petav. tom. i. p. 480.

² See vol. i. pp. 66—73.

more antient opinions.”¹ Upon which Mr. Keble remarks, “In a word, the question lay between traditive and private interpretation. Which of the two prevailed, Sozomen does not expressly say; but he does say, that this preliminary discussion proved an effectual trial of the skill of the principal debaters on each side; and that from that time St. Athanasius being there in attendance on Alexander, obtained the lead in the proceedings of the Council. This does not look as if Athanasius had failed in the preliminary debate, and we know which side he must have taken in it.” (pp. 128, 9.)

Such is another of the far-fetched extraordinary arguments by which, *in the absence of the account given by Athanasius of the actual proceedings*, our author would support his view of the conduct of this Council. According to him, then, the Council thought it *right*, “without trial, to follow after the more antient opinions,” and contented themselves with just following Church-tradition. Now, not to mention the real facts of the case, as given by Athanasius, the very author here quoted by Mr. Keble tells us just after, that there was a long disputation concerning the faith, and that *at last* they all agreed together, and decreed that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, except a few,² which passage alone might have led him to doubt the soundness of his far-fetched inference. But the Emperor Constantine, in his Letter to the Churches respecting the Council, *distinctly says*, that all the points in dispute were thoroughly *searched into*, until a determination acceptable to God was *brought to light*.³

¹ SOZOMEN. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 17. (al. 16.) sub. fin. pp. 35, 6. Ed. Reading.

² Εκ τούτου δε ἡ περὶ τοῦ δογματος διαλεξις ἐκινήθη τοῖς ἱερεῦσι· Σχολῇ δε καὶ μαλὰ ἀνεξίκακως ἠκροάτο ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἑκατέρωθεν λόγων . . . το δὴ τελευταίον, συνεβήσαν αλλήλοις πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ ὁμοουσίον εἶναι τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐψηφίσαντο· μόνοι δε τὰ μὲν πρῶτα δέκα καὶ ἑπτὰ λέγονται τὴν Ἀρείου δοξάν ἐπαινεῖσαι κ. τ. λ. SOZOMEN. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 20. (al. 19.) init. p. 38. ed. Read.

³ Ἀχρι τοσούτου ἅπαντα τῆς προσηκουσῆς τετυχηκεν ἐξετάσεως, ἀχρις οὐ ἡ τῷ

His next argument is, however, still more extraordinary. "Moreover, Sozomen goes on to record, in immediate connection with this discussion, the well-known anecdote of the aged and unlearned confessor, who silenced a pagan disputer, present at the Council, by the bare recital of his baptismal creed;" and having given the anecdote, he adds,—“Not to *dwell* on the possibility that here is something of a DIVINE SANCTION GIVEN TO THE APPEAL TO ANTIQUITY, WHICH OUR ARGUMENT SUPPOSES, even the lowest statement, that of Socrates, implies a decided preference there given to traditional over private interpretations. It shows what bias the Fathers were under the day before the Council was holden.” (pp. 129, 30.) So that actually one cannot refer to the creed as containing our belief without showing, to a demonstration, that we uphold Mr. Keble’s views of tradition. But the fact is, that any one who will take the trouble of referring to Sozomen’s account of this matter, will find that it is utterly irrelevant to the point in hand. Sozomen tells us that several philosophers were present at the Council of Nice, for the sake of knowing what was the Christian faith; and that upon one of them talking boastingly and derisively on the subject, a simple and unlearned confessor said, “In the name of Jesus Christ, hear me, O philosopher. There is one God, the maker of heaven and earth, and all things visible and invisible, who made all things by the power of the Word, and established them by the sacred influence of the Holy Spirit. This Word, therefore, whom we call the Son of God, pitying men for their errors and wretched mode of living, vouchsafed to be born of a woman, and live among men, and die for them, and he will come again to pronounce sentence upon all for their deeds. That these things are so, we believe, without curious investigation. Do not, therefore, labour in vain, seeking for proofs of

παντων εφορω Θεω αρεσκουσα γνωμη προς την της ενσθητος συμφωνιων εις φως προηχθη, ως μηδεν επι προς διχονοιαν η πιστεως αμφισβητησιν υπολειπεσθαι.
EUSEB. Vit. Constant. lib. iii. c. 17. (al. 16.) pp. 586, 7. ed. Reading.

those things which are understood by faith, and the manner in which these things may or may not be done. But answer me, whether you believe; to which the philosopher, struck with astonishment, replies, I believe.”¹ Such is the anecdote from which Mr. Keble’s inference is derived. The reader will at once perceive that there is not the slightest reference to Church-tradition, or even any form of creed, but simply an enunciation of the great points of the Christian faith revealed in Scripture. Mr. Keble must be hard pressed indeed for arguments when he makes use of such as these. Had he been opposing the views of those who think that the credibility of revealed truth is to be judged by natural reason, then indeed this anecdote might have had its weight in his favour; but how it can be quoted as tending to establish the authority of Church-tradition, I cannot understand.

He then cites the reply of Acesius to Constantine;—“It is no new matter, O Emperor, which the Synod hath determined; for so, from of old, from the beginning, even from the times of the Apostles, I have received the definition of the faith.” (p. 130.)² But this is nothing to the purpose; for we do not affirm that the doctrine maintained at Nice was new to the Church, but the contrary. The only point in question is, Upon what foundation the doctrine was placed.

Then it is said, Eustathius tells us that the blasphemy of Eusebius of Nicomedia “caused, at first hearing, inconceivable grief to the audience, *on account of its great deviation.*”³ Well, deviation from what? My reply would be, deviation from the truth which they believed to be

¹ SOZOMEN. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 18. (al. 17.) pp. 36, 7. ed. Reading.

² ‘Ο δε, ουδεν καινον, εφη, ω βασιλευ, η συνοδος ωρισεν’ οντω γαρ ανωθεν και εξ αρχης εκ των αποστολικων χρονων παρειληφα και τον δρον της πιστews και τον χρονον της του Πασχα εορτης. SOCR. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 10. (al. 7.) p. 38. ed. Read. See also GELAS. CYZ. lib. ii. c. 30. ed. 1599. pp. 169, 70.

³ ‘Ως δε εξητειτο της πιστews ο τροπος, εναργης μεν ελεγχος το γραμμα της Ευσεβιου προβαλλετο βλασφημιας’ επι παντων δε αναγνωσθεν, αυτικα συμφοραν μεν ασταθμητον της εκτροπης ενεκα τοις αυτηκοις προξενει. THEODOR. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 7. (p. 759.)

revealed in Scripture ; and which, consequently, they had been in the habit of considering the orthodox Christian faith.

The last argument is derived from the words with which Eusebius of Cæsarea prefaces the creed which he proposed to the Council, which were these,—“ As we have received from the bishops before us, in our first catechetical instruction, and when we were baptized, as also we have learned out of the divine Scriptures, and as we have both believed and taught . . . we offer unto you our faith ;”¹ from which Mr. Keble would wish us to conclude that Eusebius supported his view of the authority of Church-tradition ; and this, notwithstanding that in these very words Eusebius has himself told us that he *learned these things out of the divine Scriptures*. Mr. Keble appears to have forgotten that the question is,—not whether a certain form of words, by which many of those who have gone before us have expressed their belief, may or may not be used by us to express our belief, but—what are *the grounds* of our belief ; and whether Scripture only is the foundation upon which our belief (however expressed) rests ; in other words, whether we accept the creed as the *authoritative* interpretation of Scripture, derived from Church-tradition, from which it would not have been allowable for us to depart, whatever might have been its testimony ; or, as, in our view, a faithful representation of the truth, as revealed in Scripture. And in these words of Eusebius, as in most other similar references to the creed by the early Fathers, he may clearly see that the latter was the view which they held of the matter.

¹ Καθως παρελαβομεν παρα των προ ἡμων επισκοπων, εν τη πρωτη κατηχησει, και οτε το λουτρον ελαβανομεν, καθως και απο των θειων γραφων μεμαθηκομεν, και ως εν αυτω τω πρεσβυτεριω, και εν αυτη τη ἐπισκοπη επιστευομεν τε και ἐδιδασκομεν, οὕτω και νυν πιστευοντες την ἡμετεραν πιστιν προσαναφερομεν. EUSEB. CÆS. Epist. ad. Dioces. in. THEOD. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 11. (p. 776, 7.) This letter of Eusebius is also to be found in SOCRAT. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 8. (al. 5.) GELAS. CYZIC. Comment. Act. Conc. Nic. lib. ii. c. 35. (pp. 179 et seq.) and in the Benedictine edition of Athanasius at the end of his Treatise, *De Decr. Syn. Nic.*

Further ; as to the word “ consubstantial : ” Mr. Keble tells us that “ the Fathers went to *Church-tradition* for the critical and decisive phrase ‘ of one substance with the Father. ’ ” (p. 138.) And he refers us, in a note, to Athanasius (De Decr. Syn. Nic. § 25—27. i. 230), as his authority for the assertion. But Athanasius, neither here nor anywhere else, says anything like this. What he says is this ;—“ They, therefore, who were assembled at Nice *holding this view*, used also such expressions [here is *the reason* given why they used the terms in question] ; *Moreover* let us also proceed to show, that they did not invent these terms for themselves, since *this, also, is pretended* ; but used expressions which they had received from former times, from those who went before them ; so that *not even* THIS *pretence may be left to them*. Learn, therefore, O ye Arians, enemies of Christ, that Theognostus, a man of repute, hesitated not to use the expression ‘ of the substance. ’ Dionysius, moreover, that was Bishop of Alexandria affirmed that he confessed the Son to be ‘ consubstantial. ’ ”¹ That is, some few of the Fathers, who lived before the Council of Nice, had used the phrase. But this is a totally different thing to saying that the Fathers “ went to *Church-tradition* for the phrase.”

And so, a little further on, he still more plainly shows that the Fathers at Nice selected the word consubstantial on the ground—not of any Church-tradition in its favour, but—of its expressing their view of the sense of Scripture ; and that his reference to the use of the word by former Fathers, was merely by way of a confirmation, *as far as it went*, of the correctness of their view. “ I have already

¹ ‘Οι μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ Νίκαιᾳ συνελθόντες ταυτὴν ἔχοντες τὴν διανοίαν, τοιαύτας καὶ τὰς λέξεις ἐγράψαν. ‘Ὅτι δὲ οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς πλασάντες ἐπειροῶσαν ταύτας, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοῦτο προφασίζονται, ἀλλ’ ἀνῶθεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν παραλαβόντες εἰρηκασί, φερε καὶ τοῦτο διελεγχώμεν, ἵνα μὴδὲ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἢ προφασίς περιλειπῇται. Μάθετε τοίνυν ὧς Χριστομαχοὶ Ἀρειανοὶ, ὅτι Θεογνώστος μὲν, ἀνὴρ λογίος, οὐ παρητήσατο τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας εἰπεῖν Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ γενομένος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ὁμοουσίον αὐτὸν [i. e. τὸν υἱόν] ὁμολογεῖν διεβεβαίωσατο. ΑΘΗΝΑΣ. De Decret. Nic. Synod. § 25. tom. i. p. 230.

related," he says, "*the reason* and the meaning which the Synod had in using the words 'of the substance' and 'consubstantial,' agreeably to what is said of the Saviour out of the Scriptures; and *what* Fathers before them made use of the same expressions." ¹ Such, also, is the account he gives of the matter, in his letter to the African bishops.—"The bishops," he says, "did not invent these phrases for themselves; but had testimony from Fathers for them, when they wrote thus. For antient bishops, nearly one hundred and thirty years before, of great Rome, and of our own city, blamed in their writings those who said that the Son was a created being, and not consubstantial with the Father. And of this, Eusebius, who was Bishop of Cæsarea, was conscious, who at first was disposed towards the Arian heresy. But afterwards, having subscribed in the Nicene Synod itself, he wrote to his people, affirming, 'We know that *certain* learned and illustrious bishops and writers of the antients used the word, consubstantial, in relation to the divinity of the Father and Son.'"²

All, then, that was contended for in behalf of the word on this ground was, that some authors of good name had used it before; and this notice of its previous use, by some of the earlier Fathers, was evidently merely intended by Athanasius to make it a little more palatable to those who objected to it, by showing them that some, whose opinion

² Ἐγώ μὲν γὰρ τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ τὴν διανοίαν, καθ' ἣν ἡ συνόδος το ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ το ὁμοουσιον συμφώνως τοῖς ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἰρημικοῖς, καὶ ὅσοι προ αὐτῶν ἐξεβέντο πατέρες καὶ ἐγράψαν, διηγήσαμην. De Decret. Syn. Nic. § 28, i. 234.

² Ὅτι δὲ ἐπισκοποὶ, οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς εὗροντες τὰς λέξεις, ἀλλ' ἐκ πατέρων ἔχοντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν, οὕτως ἐγράψαν ἐπισκοποὶ γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι προ ἐτῶν ἐγγύς που ἑκατὸν τριακοντα, τῆς μεγάλῃς Ῥώμης, καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως γραφόντες ἠγιάσαντο τοὺς ποιήματα λεγόντας τὸν υἱὸν καὶ μὴ ὁμοουσιον τῷ Πατρὶ. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐγινώσκειν Εὐσεβίου ὁ γενομένος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Καισαρείας, πρότερον μὲν συντρέχων τῇ Ἀρειανῇ αἵρεσιν, ὕστερον δὲ ὑπογράφας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐν Νίκαιᾳ συνόδῳ, ἐγράψε τοῖς ἰδιοῖς διοβηβαίοι μενος, ὅτι καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν τινὰς λογίους καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐπισκοποὺς καὶ συγγραφεὰς ἐγνώμεν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ θεότητος τῷ τοῦ ὁμοουσιου χρησάμενους ὀνοματί. ATHANAS. Ad Afros Episc. Ep. § 6. tom. i. p. 896.

they might esteem, had sanctioned the use of it. It is clear, however, that whatever might be the claims of Church-tradition, the use of a word by two or three writers, spread over three centuries, could not give it a right to participate in those claims. And certainly Augustine knew nothing of this tradition; for he tells us, in a passage already quoted in a previous page,¹ that the Nicene Fathers “made the word to meet the impiety of the Arian heretics;” which, I admit, is a mistake in the other extreme; but, nevertheless, shows that he did not believe it to be derived from Church-tradition.

Nay, more, *it had not the sanction of Church-tradition*, for its use had been *directly opposed*, and that by orthodox Fathers, as Athanasius himself tells us. The Fathers assembled at a Synod at Antioch against Paul of Samosata, in the latter part of the third century,² determined, as we are informed by Athanasius,³ and Basil,⁴ and Hilary,⁵ that “the Son is not consubstantial with the Father;” rejecting the word “consubstantial,” as Basil tells us, as not appropriate; “giving the idea of substance and things derived from it; so that a divided substance would give the appellation of consubstantial to those things into which it was divided.”⁶ The word was *rejected*, where

¹ See page 9 above.

² The first Council at Antioch held against Paulus Samosatenus, met about the year 264, at which, according to Theodoret, [Hær. Fab. lib. 2. § 8. tom. iv. p. 334.] the famous Gregory Thaumaturgus presided, and Firmilian of Cæsarea and other eminent bishops were present. It is said that they did not pass sentence against him in this Synod, on account of his promising to give up his error; but that he did not do so. The second Council held against him at Antioch, and in which he was formally condemned, was held about the year 270. Which of these two Synods is referred to by the writers quoted above, is somewhat doubtful.

³ See ATHANAS. De Synod. Arimin. et Seleuc. habitis. § 43 and 44, tom. i. p. 757.

⁴ BASIL. Ep. 52. Ed. Bened. tom. iii. p. 145.

⁵ HILAR. De Synod. § 81. Col. 1196. Ed. Bened.

⁶ Καὶ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι, οἱ ἐπὶ Παύλῳ τῷ Σαμοσατέϊ συνελθόντες διεβάλον τὴν λέξιν [i. e. ὁμοουσίον] ὥς οὐκ εὐσημον. Ἐφασαν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τὴν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου φωνὴν παρίσταν ἐννοίαν οὐσίας τε καὶ τῶν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς, ὥστε καταμερίσθαι τὴν οὐσίαν παρεχεῖν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου τὴν προσηγορίαν τοῖς εἰς ἃ διηρέθη. BASIL. Ep. 52. Ed. Bened. tom. iii. p. 145.

the orthodox opinion was maintained ; as was the case, as Athanasius tells us, with some in his time ; of whom, nevertheless, he says, “ With respect to those who fully receive everything else of the things written at Nicæa, but doubt only respecting the word ‘ consubstantial,’ it is not right to look upon them as enemies ; for we also do not contend with them as against Arians, nor as persons fighting against the Fathers, [a name continually given by Athanasius to the *Nicene* bishops], but reason with them as brethren with brethren, holding the same view with us, but differing only about the word.”¹ And a little further on he allows that “ of the Fathers [i. e. the Fathers in general] some spoke in favour of, and some against, the word ‘ consubstantial.’ ”² The phrase “ consubstantial with the Father,” therefore, had *not* the sanction of *Church-tradition*.

Consequently when the bishops assembled at Nice used it, the responsibility of so using it, rested upon them ; and it was evidently so used by them, because, in their judgment, it best expressed the *Scriptural* doctrine. So, indeed, Athanasius himself tells us ; for having explained and defended the phrase from Scripture, and supported it on the ground that, though not in Scripture, it expressed the sense we derive from Scripture of the matter, he adds, (in the passage quoted above)—“ They, therefore, who were assembled at Nice holding this view, used, also, such expressions.” And then he proceeds to say that “ moreover” they did not invent the word, but made use of one which had been used by *some* who went before them.

Mr. Keble’s argument, therefore, in favour of the authority of Church-tradition, because “ the Fathers went

¹ *Προς δε τους αποδεχομενους τα μεν αλλα παντα των εν Νικαια γραφεντων, περι δε μοιον το ομμουσιον αμφιβαλλοντας, χρη μη ως προς εχθρους διακεισθαι και γαρ και ημεις ουχ ως προς Αρειομανιτας, ουδ’ ως μαχομενους προς τους πατερας ενισταμεθα, αλλ’ ως αδελφοι προς αδελφους διαλεγομεθα, την αυτην μεν ημιν διανοιαν εχοντας, περι δε το ονομα μονον δισταζοντας.* ATHANAS. *De Syn. Arim. et Seleuc.* hab. § 41. tom. i. p. 755.

² *Ουτως ει και των πατερων, οι μεν ουτως, οι δε ουτως ειρηκασι περι του ομμουσιου, μη φιλονεικωμεν ημεις, κ. τ. λ.* ATHANAS. *ib.* § 46. p. 761.

to Church-tradition for the word consubstantial," is altogether a mistake.

What is perhaps still more extraordinary in Mr. Keble's account of the acts of the Council, is that he brings in the name of Bishop Taylor as one who has, in his review of the proceedings at Nice, sanctioned his statements. For, at the close of his account, heading his page with the words, "*Proceedings at Nicæa, how related by Jackson, by Leslie, and by Bishop Taylor,*" he gives the following passage from the bishop,—“Bishop Taylor says (x. 462.) ‘It is not certain that the Nicene Fathers, at their meeting, recited any other creed than the Apostolical,’ assuming that they recited some creed.” (p. 139.) What support Mr. Keble's views can receive from this statement, I do not see; but the obvious intention is to lead the reader to suppose that the bishop's account of the “proceedings at Nicæa,” is similar to that we are reviewing. Now, in the very same work from which Mr. Keble has quoted this passage, Bishop Taylor says,—“Whatever it was which was there [i. e. at Nice] determined, I am sure *it was not determined by tradition, but by Scripture.*”—“When Constantine the emperor exhorted the Nicene Fathers to concord in the question then to be disputed, they being divine matters, he would they should be ended by the authority of the divine Scriptures. ‘For, saith he, the books of the Evangelists and the Apostles, as also the oracles of the old prophets, do evidently teach us what we are to think of the Deity. Therefore all seditious contention being laid aside, let us determine the things brought into question by the testimonies of the divinely-inspired Scriptures.’ *And they did so.* And by relying on *Scriptures only*, we shall never be constrained to quit these glorious portions of evangelical truth, the incarnation of the eternal Word, and the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son.”—“The Arians offered to be tried by tradition . . . St. Athanasius did sometimes pretend to it, though not always; and this shows that *there was no clear, indubitate, notorious,*

universal tradition in the question; and if there were not such an one, *as good none at all*; for it could not be such a foundation as was fit to build our faith upon, especially in such mysterious articles. But it is remarkable what Eusebius (Ecel. Hist. lib. 5. c. 28) recites out of an old author, who wrote against the heresy of Artemon, which afterwards Samosatenus renewed, and Arius made public with some alteration. ‘They all say,’ says he, ‘that our ancestors and the Apostles themselves not only received from our Lord those things which they now affirm, but that they taught it to others; and the preaching or tradition of it run on to the days of Pope Victor, and was kept entire, but was depraved by Pope Zephyrinus. And truly that which was said by them, might seem to have in it much of probability, if the divine Scriptures did not first of all contradict them; and that there were writings of some brethren older than the times of Victor.’ The brethren, whose writings he names, are Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clemens, Irenæus, and the psalms and hymns of divers, made in honour of Christ. From all which it is *evident that the questions at Nice were not, and could not be determined by tradition.* 2. That tradition might be, and was, pretended on both sides. 3. That when it is pretended by the contradicting parties, with some probability, it can effectually serve neither. 4. That the tradition the Samosatensians and Arians boasted of, had in it much probability, when looked upon in its own series and proper state. 5. That the divine Scriptures were at that time the best firmament of the Church, and defended her from that abuse which might have been imposed upon her, under the title of tradition,” &c. (Dissuasive from Popery, Pt. 2. bk. 1. § 3. Works, vol. x. pp. 428—30.)

Such is the clear statement of Bishop Taylor, in opposition to the account given us by Mr. Keble.

The quotation from Dr. Jackson is certainly more in his favour. But of course no statements of modern writers can have any authority in the matter, except so

far as they are borne out by the reports left us by the antients of the proceedings of the Council.

The statement quoted from Leslie, referring, not to the Council of Nice, but to the preceding provincial Synod at Alexandria against Arius, is so glaringly incorrect, that it is worth no one's picking up. "This," says Leslie, "was the method taken in the Council called at Alexandria against Arius; it was asked by Alexander, the Archbishop, who presided, *Quis unquam talia audivit?* Who ever heard of this doctrine before? *And it being answered by all the bishops there assembled in the negative, it was concluded a novel doctrine, and contrary to what had been universally received in the Christian Church.*" Let the reader only compare this statement with the extracts given above from Alexander's letter, from which it professes to be taken, and he will then be able to judge how far he can trust to such loose references to antient writings, even when made by men of the highest integrity. The whole statement about the bishops answering in the negative, and its being therefore concluded a novel doctrine, &c., is not only a complete fiction, but directly contrary to the representation actually given in the letter of Alexander; to which we may add that Sozomen expressly tells us that the matter was so hotly debated in this Council, that its members could not agree among themselves in the matter; but that Alexander at last decided in favour of those who supported the view of the Son's consubstantiality and co-eternity with the Father.¹

Mr. Keble concludes with three more references to

¹ Κριτης καθισας [i. e. Αλεξανδρος] συν τοις απο του κληρου εις ἀμιλλαν αμφοτερους ηγαγεν' ὡς δε συμβαινειν φιλει περι τας εριδας των λογων, ἑκατερος ἐπειρατο νικαν. Συνιστᾶται δὲ Ἀρε.ος μεν τοις παρ' αὐτου ειρημενοις· οἱ δὲ, ὡς ὁμοουσιος και συναιδιος εστιν ὁ υἱος τῷ Πατρι. Συνεδριου δὲ παλιν γενομενου, τοσαυτας διαλεξεις ανακινήσαντες ου συνεβησαν αλληλοις. Ἀμφηριστου δὲ τῆς ζήτησεως ἐτι δοκουσης ειναι, πεπονθε τι και Αλεξανδρος τα πρωτα, πῃ μεν τουτους πῃ δὲ ἐκεινους ἐπαινων· τελευτων δὲ, τοις ὁμοουσιον και συναιδιον ειναι τον υἱον ἀποφαινομενοις ἐθετο, και τον Ἀρειον ὁμοιως φρονειν ἐκελευσε. SOZOMEN. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 15. (al. 14.) pp. 31. 2. ed. Read.

Athanasius, and one to Epiphanius, upon which it is necessary to offer a few remarks.

The first passage¹ is adduced to prove "the instinctive and inevitable comparison which the new doctrines underwent with those before received," and (as I suppose Mr. Keble would have us conclude) the consequent rejection of the new. But the passage is merely an appeal to the reader whether he had not always understood the word Son, learned in his first catechism, as implying identity of substance with the Father, and consequently whether he had not been surprised at the doctrine of Arius, as something different to what he had been always taught; an appeal which the strongest opponents of Mr. Keble's views would not hesitate to make in a similar case, and which, therefore, we may pass over without further remark.

"Secondly," adds Mr. Keble, "he [i. e. Athanasius] presents the creed to the Emperor Jovian, not merely as the judgment of the present Church on the meaning of the Scriptures, but rather as her testimony to the fact that 'this faith had all along been known to all in the Church, being learned and read out of the divine Scriptures. For in this, the saints being perfected, endured martyrdom.'" &c. (p. 140.) Now, in the original, there is not one word to authorize the observation with which this citation is introduced, as to the presentation of the creed to the Emperor Jovian, as the Church's testimony to the fact, &c.; nor anything corresponding to the apparent quotation that "this faith had all along been known to all in the Church." The passage, with the preceding context, is this. "Your piety, therefore, being desirous of learning from us the faith of the Catholic Church, having given thanks for this to the Lord, we have thought good above all things to bring to the remembrance of your piety the creed confessed by the Fathers at Nicæa.

¹ Orat. 2a. contra Arian. § 34, tom. i. p. 502. B. See Keble's Serm. pp. 139, 140.

For some having rejected this, have in various ways plotted against us, because we do not assent to the Arian heresy, and have become the causes of heresy and schisms in the Catholic Church. For the true and pious faith in the Lord hath stood forth evident to all, being known and read out of the divine Scriptures. For in this, the saints being perfected, endured martyrdom," &c.¹ Now this passage, so far from being favourable to Mr. Keble's view, is directly opposed to it; for it expressly tells us that the true faith is evident to all, *as being* known and read out of the divine Scriptures.

The next quotation stands thus;—"The Fathers inserted the clause of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father, and anathematized those who affirmed a diversity of substance, not in terms which they had framed for themselves, but which they too had learned from the Fathers before them which being so, the creed of Nicæa is sufficient, agreeing as it does also with the antient bishops." "This," adds Mr. Keble, "shows in what light the framers of the creed wished it to be viewed." Now the real passage, as it stands in Athanasius, is in more than one point very different, and runs thus;—"The Fathers, *having taken this view of the matter*, wrote that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, and anathematized those who say that the Son is of a different substance, not having invented phrases for themselves, but *having themselves learnt them from the Fathers before them*, as we have said. *These things*,

¹ Θελήσας τοίνυν τῆς σὺς εὐσεβείας μαθεῖν παρ' ἡμῶν τὴν τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας πίστιν, εὐχαριστήσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦτοις τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἐβουλευσάμεθα μᾶλλον πάντων τὴν παρὰ τῶν Πατέρων ἐν Νικαίᾳ ὁμολογηθεῖσαν πίστιν ὑπομνησαί τὴν σὴν εὐσεβείαν· ταύτην γὰρ ἀθετήσαντες τινες, ἡμῖν μὲν ποικίλως ἐπεβουλευσαν, ὅτι μὴ ἐπειθομένα τῇ Ἀρειανῇ αἰρέσει· αὐτοὶ δὲ γεγوناσιν αἵρεσέως καὶ σχισμάτων τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἥ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθὴς καὶ εὐσεβὴς εἰς τὸν Κύριον πίστις φανερά πασι καθεστῆκεν, ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν γινωσκομένη τε καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη· ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι τελειωθέντες ἐμαρτύρησαν, κ. τ. λ. ATHANAS. Epist. ad Jovian. § 1. tom. i. p. 780. The Benedictine translation of the latter part is, *nemini tamen obscura esse potest vera et pia in Dominum fides, ut quæ ex divinis Scripturis haberi et internosci queant.*

therefore, being thus demonstrated, their Synod at Ariminum is superfluous; and the other Synod concerning the faith named by them, is superfluous; for *that at Nicæa* is sufficient, being also in agreement with the antient bishops, in which also their Fathers subscribed.”¹ Now, here all is consistent with the accounts we have already quoted from Athanasius. The Fathers, taking that view of the matter which is laid down in Scripture, which Athanasius has been just before describing, wrote, on that authority, that the Son was consubstantial with the Father; and in so doing, did not use an expression which was entirely new; for some of the earlier Fathers had used it, which, of course, *as far as it went*, was an argument in its favour. And these matters having been in the Nicene Council fully investigated, and *demonstrated* to be as the Nicene creed represented them to be, it was unnecessary that any other Council should be called upon the same matter; the decision of the Council of Nice having also the argument in its favour, as it appeared to him, that it was in unison with that of the antient bishops. The reader will observe, not only the different turn given to the sentence by the words omitted by Mr. Keble at the beginning of it, but more especially that the stringent words, “*which being so, the Creed of Nicæa is sufficient,*” are a complete (however unintentional) misrepresentation of the passage.

To these three passages of Athanasius, quoted by Mr. Keble, I would add for *his* consideration the two following. In his Letter concerning the decrees of the Nicene Council, Athanasius, after discussing the points controverted at Nice, adds these words,—“And of these things we are certified, not from any external source, but from

¹ Οὕτω νοήσαντες οἱ Πατέρες ἐγράψαν ὁμοουσιον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ἀνεθεματίσαν τοὺς λεγόντας, ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν· οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς πλασάμενοι λέξεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπο τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν πατέρων μαθόντες, καθάπερ εἶπομεν. Τούτων δὲ οὕτω δεικνυμένων, περιττὴ αὐτῶν ἡ Ἀριμηνος, περιττὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη παρ’ αὐτῶν ὀνομαζομένη περὶ πίστεως συνοδος· ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ἡ ἐν Νικαίᾳ, συμφωνοῦσα καὶ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐπίσκοποις, ἐν ἧ καὶ οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν ὑπεγράψαν. ATHANAS. Epist. ad Afros Episc. § 9. tom. i. p. 898.

the Scriptures.”¹ Moreover, how unwillingly even a *word* was used, not found expressly in the Scriptures, we may judge from the following passage in the same Letter. “But, perhaps, being reproved for the word uncreated, they will themselves, in their impiety, say, It behoves us, also, with respect to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to speak *from the Scriptures those things which are written respecting him, and not to introduce phrases not to be found in the Scriptures.* IT DOES, INDEED, BEHOVE US SO TO DO, I SHOULD MYSELF ALSO SAY, *for the representations of the truth derived from the Scriptures are much more exact, than those derived from any other source;* but the perverseness, and artful and versatile impiety of the Eusebians, compelled the bishops, as I before said, to set forth words more plainly subversive of their impiety; and those words which were written by the Council have been proved to have a right sense.”² From which we may see that the use of the words by preceding bishops, formed no sufficient authority, in the estimation of Athanasius, for their being considered orthodox; and that Scripture was so completely the sole authority followed, that even words not found therein, though appearing to express a Scriptural sense, were very reluctantly used.

There remains one more passage, viz., that from Epiphanius,—which, according to Mr. Keble, runs thus;—“They professed the faith of the Fathers, orthodox and unswerving; and delivered down to us from the Apostles and Prophets,” (p. 141); the real passage being this; “They profess the orthodox faith of the Fathers, which

Και τούτων ουκ εξωθεν ἡμεῖς ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ἐχομεν τὴν πίστιν. ATHANAS. De Decret. Nic. Syn. § 17. tom. i. p. 222.

² ΑΛΛ’ ἴσως καὶ διὰ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀγεννητὸν ἐλεγχθέντες, πονηροὶ τὸν τρόπον ὄντες, ἐβέλησουσι καὶ αὐτοὶ λεγεῖν· εἶδει καὶ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα λεγεσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἀγραφούς ἐπεισαγεσθαι λέξεις. Ναι εἶδει, φαῖναι ἂν καὶ ἐγῶγε· ἀκριβεστέρα γὰρ ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρων ἐστὶ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας γνωρίσματα· ἀλλ’ ἡ κακοηθεὶα καὶ μετὰ πανουργίας παλιμβολὸς ἀσεβεία τῶν περὶ Εὐσεβίον ἠναγκάσκει, καθὰ προείπον, τοὺς ἐπισκοποὺς λευκοτερον ἐκθεσθαι τὰ τὴν ἀσεβείαν αὐτῶν ἀνατρεπόντα ῥήματα· καὶ τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῆς συνόδου γραφέντα διανοίαν ὀρθὴν ἐχόντα δεδεικται. ATHANAS. De Decret. Nic. Syn. § 32. tom. i. p. 237.

is also immutable, and was delivered by the Apostles and Prophets.”¹ The notion of successional delivery, implied in the terms “*down to us*,” has no place in the original, and if it had, the passage would only state a matter of fact which we do not call in question.

Wearisome as the examination of these passages may have been, the result will, I suppose, have proved the necessity of it, and produce at least one good effect, namely, that the reader will be set on his guard in this matter, and prevented from hastily putting credence in such representations, without comparing them with the originals; as it is evident, from the specimens given above, how completely he may be misled, even where, as in the case before us, he may have every motive for confidence which character can give.

I have now gone through the whole of Mr. Keble’s arguments and authorities, by which he has attempted to support his view of the mode of proceeding adopted at Nice, and shall leave the reader to judge how far his conclusion holds good, that the Nicene Fathers were “earnest and constant in resorting to tradition, in order to decide among conflicting interpretations of Scripture, and settle the fundamentals of our most holy faith.” (p.141.) One thing only I would add, and that is, that when he speaks as if those who opposed his views discarded the testimony of the primitive Church to the faith as useless, and no help to the understanding of Scripture, or confirmation of our view of its meaning, he very sadly misrepresents their sentiments, and makes use of a mere controversial artifice, by which no impartial reader will be deceived. The question, the sole question is, whether we have an infallible Church-tradition, binding the conscience to receive what it delivers as the meaning of Scripture, or whether our faith ought to rest on Scripture only. We affirm the latter, and also that such was the

¹ Ὁμολογοῦσι τὴν τῶν Πατέρων ὀρθοδόξον πίστιν καὶ ἀκλινὴ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ Προφητῶν παραδοθεῖσαν. EPIPH. in HÆR. Arian. § 11. Ed. Petav. tom. i. p. 735.

mind of the Nicene and earlier Fathers, who appealed to the testimony of Fathers who went before them, not as a testimony binding upon the conscience, (and thus *practically* superseding Scripture,) but as one which might reasonably be an additional moral inducement to lead men to believe that the doctrine they supported was the doctrine of Scripture; and in the consciousness that it was but reasonable that such testimony in favour of their views should be required of them, to show that they were not novelists. Church-tradition, in that sense in which alone it could be considered “practically infallible,” as Mr. Keble calls it, namely, as implying a strictly universal consent, never could and never can be had, even for any one moment, during the whole period of the Church’s existence. That such was the mind of the Nicene Fathers, is evident from the course of their deliberations, as described by Athanasius. Had they held the notions of our opponents on the subject, there would have been some reference made by them to ecclesiastical tradition as the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, and consequently their authority for the interpretation they gave to Scripture in their decision. But, on the contrary, we find from the various passages given above from Athanasius, that their judgment was given directly from Scripture, without any such reference. Nay, they had evidently no idea of being in possession of any such authoritative interpretation, for it appears that their intention and great desire was to use nothing but phrases occurring in Scripture, and that they very reluctantly adopted a *word* not found in Scripture, and then only on the consideration that that word seemed compendiously to express the meaning of a number of *Scriptural* phrases they had collected together *for the purpose of obtaining* the sense of Scripture on the subject.

Let our opponents hear one of their own chosen witnesses, Bishop Patrick,—“This tradition [i. e. the Nicene Creed] supposes the Scripture for its ground; and delivers nothing but what the Fathers assembled at Nice

believed to be contained there, and was *first fetched from thence*.”¹

Nay, even a Romanist may be found giving the same account of the matter. “The Council,” says Tillemont, “perceiving their hypocrisy, collected together all the Scripture expressions which related to the Son, and comprehended them all under the word *consubstantial*, which is to say of the same substance; and all the bishops, *after long considering it*, agreed to that term. It was thus that, *after having thoroughly examined* all the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles, the Prelates, *grounding their determination upon the Holy Scriptures*, settled with great caution the perfect rule of the catholic faith. They had likewise a more particular reason for using that term. For the Council having seen, by the Letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia, which we spoke of before, that the Arians looked upon the consubstantiality as diametrically opposite to their heresy, they were willing to make use of that sword against them which they had drawn out of the scabbard themselves.”²

The same reference to Scripture as the sole authority upon which our faith is to rest in this matter, is observable in the passage of Dionysius Romanus, given to us by Athanasius on this subject, from a work of his against the Sabellians. “Not less also,” he says, “must one blame those who think that the Son is a creature, and suppose that the Lord was made like any one of things truly made, *since the divine oracles* bear witness that his generation was such as was meet and fitting for him, and that he is not a creature formed and made. It is no slight, but rather the greatest blasphemy, therefore, to say that the Lord was in any way made by hands. For if the Son was made, there was a time when he was not; but he was in existence always, if he is in the Father, [Jo. xiv. 11.]

¹ Bishop Patrick on Tradition.

² History of the Arians, by Tillemont, translated by Deacon, vol. ii. p. 623. The last statement in the above passage is derived from Ambros. De fide, lib. iii. c. 7.

as he himself says; and if Christ is the Word, and Wisdom, and Power; *for the divine Scriptures say*, that Christ is these, as ye know To the absurdities that follow, from saying that the Son is a creature, the leaders of this opinion do not appear to me to have attended, and consequently to have erred altogether from the truth, having understood the passage, ‘The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways’ [Prov. viii. 22.] contrary to *the meaning of the divine and prophetic Scripture* in this respect. For the word ‘created,’ as ye know, has more than one signification And any one may see that the Son is often said by *the divine oracles* to have been begotten, but not, to have been made; *by which* they who embrace false notions respecting the generation of the Lord, are *evidently condemned*, who dare to say that his divine and unutterable generation was a creation. Therefore, we must not divide the wonderful and divine unity into three divinities, nor diminish by the notion of creation the dignity and excellent greatness of the Lord, but believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and that the Word is united to the God of the Universe; *for he says*, ‘I and my Father are one;’ [Jo. x. 30.] and, ‘I am in the Father and the Father in me.’ [Jo. xiv. 10.]”¹

There is not in the whole passage the slightest allusion to anything but Scripture; not one word to lead us to suppose that he knew anything of ecclesiastical tradition as the authoritative interpreter of Scripture.

In conclusion, I will add a few words on an argument which, as it has been used by the Romanists, may possibly be resorted to by the Tractators. They will perhaps be disposed to reply, True, these Fathers did go to Scripture only for their proof, and appeared to draw their conclusions directly from Scripture, but this was only because their adversaries refused and rejected ecclesiastical tradition, but the authority upon which they

¹ DIONYS. ROM. adv. Sabell. cit. in Athanas. De Decret. Nic. Synod. § 26. tom. i. p. 231.

rested in their own minds for their interpretation of Scripture, and which they felt themselves bound in conscience to obey, was ecclesiastical tradition. This is in fact their last hold, and, like the Romanists, they studiously endeavour to make us suppose that the heretics rejected ecclesiastical tradition,¹ but it is a refuge wholly untenable. For the supposed fact upon which the argument is founded is anything but a fact. The heretics were remarkable for appealing to tradition. In the case of Arius, now before us, we find him making a direct appeal to the testimony of antiquity as in his favour, and in a Letter of his to Pope Alexander, preserved by Epiphanius, he introduces his creed as the creed which he had *learnt from his ancestors*.² This is a point, however, to which we have already directed the reader's attention,³ and therefore I would only observe here, that it is a complete reply to any such objection as we have supposed to our availing ourselves of the full value of the testimony which the conduct of the Nicene Council bears to the correctness of the views we are advocating. And hence we may estimate the accuracy of Mr. Newman's statement, that "when the history of Arianism is examined, this peculiarity will be found respecting it, that it appealed *only to Scripture*, not to catholic tradition;⁴ which from one who professes to have examined its history, and has published a book on the subject, is somewhat extraordinary.

The Tractators must pardon me for saying, that their statements, when taken as a whole, incontestably prove that they have received their views not from a careful and impartial perusal of the Fathers themselves, but from the works of Romish and semi-Romish writers, for they are

¹ See Newman, Lect. 7 ; &c.

² Ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν ἡ ἐκ προγόνων, ἣν καὶ ἀπο σοῦ μεμαθηκαμεν μακαριε Παπα, εἰσιν αὕτη. Epiphanius in hæres. Arian. § 7. Ed. Petavius. tom. i. p. 732.

³ See vol. i. pp. 397—401. See, also, besides the passages there mentioned, Socrat. Hist. Eccl. i. 26.

⁴ Lect. p. 205.

involved in almost all their misrepresentations and mistakes.

In the preceding observations I have abstained from noticing the statements of Gelasius respecting the proceedings of the Council, because their authority has been questioned by some; but I may here add some passages from that author, showing that his account agrees with the view we have taken above, or rather, I should say, with the account we have quoted from Athanasius, of those proceedings; and certainly they afford a probable testimony of at least the principles by which the Council was governed; for *even supposing* that we are indebted to the inventive powers of Gelasius, or the more antient author from whom he professes to quote, for much of the matter contained in his details, yet the great *principles* by which the Council was governed are surely not likely to be misrepresented so soon after it was held.

Thus, then, speaks Gelasius;—"That divine assembly of orthodox priests of God that, with the Holy Spirit, investigated and set forth *through the Prophetical and Evangelical and Apostolical Scriptures* concerning the Word of Life, that is, the Son of God, that he is truly uncreated in his Divine nature, and not a creature, as that most impious enemy of God, Arius, blasphemously said against him, is truly Sion, and Jerusalem, and the high mountain of the Lord, and the house of the God of Jacob. And this venerable and holy rule of the spotless faith hath been to us in very deed a high mountain of God from above, according as the word spoken by the Lord himself first manifested, and which was delivered by the Apostles, and has now been declared by his priests assembled at Nice *by scriptural testimonies.*"¹ "And they [the Fathers at

¹ Ἀληθως γὰρ Σίων καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ὄρος Κυρίου ὑψηλοτάτων καὶ οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰακωβ, ὁ θεὸς ἐκεῖνος τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὀρθοδόξων ἱερῶν ὁμίλος· πνεύματι ἁγίῳ διασκεψαμένων καὶ παραστησαντῶν διὰ τὰς γραφῶν Προφητικῶν καὶ Εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ Ἀποστολικῶν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς ἀληθως ἀκτίστος τῇ τῆς θεότητος φύσει, καὶ οὐ κτίσμα· καθὼς ὁ θεομαχὸς καὶ ἀσεβεστάτος κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλάσφημησεν Ἀρείος. . . . Καὶ ἀληθως ὑψηλὸν ὄρος Θεοῦ ἀνωθεν

Nice] proclaimed him to be the Maker and Former of the things visible and invisible, according to the Apostolical faith delivered to his Church from the beginning, *having set forth the proofs by Scriptural testimonies.*"¹ Further on, having spoken of the disputation between the bishops and a philosopher who was advocating the cause of Arius, he says, "By the divine word, as with fire, they consumed all the subtle pretences of the philosopher like tow."² And so in a response made to the philosopher by Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, in the name of the Council, we find the bishop speaking thus,—“We have already admonished you that we must not by any means use the word, ‘how,’ with respect to the divine mysteries. For they are unutterable and incomprehensible. But *according as we have been taught out of the sacred oracles*, we will speak, so far as words will enable us to set them forth.”³

The weight necessarily attaching to the proceedings of such a Council will, I am convinced, render any apology needless for the space here given to it; and I trust that the testimonies adduced above can leave no doubt on the mind of the impartial reader what was the authority, the sole *authority* recognised by the bishops there assembled, in their deliberations respecting the faith.

How little the notions of Dr. Pusey and his party respecting this Council, either as to the nature of its proceedings, or its authority, agree with those of the Fathers,

ἡμιν, καθὰ προεδηλώσεν ὁ λόγος παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων δοθεὶς, καὶ νῦν διὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἱερῶν κατὰ τὴν Νικαίων γραφικαῖς μαρτυριαῖς τρανωθεὶς, ὁ προσκυνητὸς οὗτος καὶ ἅγιος τῆς ἀμώμητου πίστεως ὅρος. GELAS. CŸZIC. Comment. Act. Conc. Nic. Ed. Balf. 1599, lib. i. c. 9. pp. 28, 9.

¹ Κτιστὴν τε αὐτὸν καὶ δημιουργὸν ὄντων τε καὶ ἀσρατῶν ἐκηρυξαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀνεκὰθεν παραδοθεῖσαν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀποστολικὴν πίστιν, γραφικαῖς μαρτυριαῖς τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἐκδῶσαντες. Ib. lib. ii. c. 11. p. 94.

² Πᾶσας γὰρ τὰς τοῦ φιλοσόφου πολυπλακοὺς προτάσεις, ὥς πυρὶ, τῷ θείῳ λόγῳ, στυππίῳ δικῇ, κατανηλίσκον. Ib. lib. ii. c. 13. p. 99 (misprinted 89.)

³ Ἡδὲ εἰρηκαμέν σοι, ὦ βελτιστε, μηδαμῶς ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ μυστηρίων λεγέιν το ὅπως. Ἀπορρητὰ γὰρ εἰσι καὶ ἀνεπιλογίστα. Ὡς δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων ἐδιδάχθημεν, ἐρουμέν ὅσον ὁ λόγος παραστήσῃ δυνήσεται. Ib. lib. ii. c. 24. p. 154.

may be judged from the following passage of the excellent Hilary. "As in winter, in a stormy sea, it is the safest course to be observed by mariners, that when a storm rages they should return to the port whence they set out; or, as it befits careless youths, that when, in maintaining their own family, having exceeded the mode of living adopted by their parents, they have made an undue use of their liberty, there should be a return, as the only safe and necessary course, under fear of losing their patrimony, to parental habits; so amidst these shipwrecks of the faith, the heirship of the heavenly patrimony being almost lost, *it is safest for us to retain the first and sole evangelical faith confessed and understood at baptism*, [which he tells us elsewhere was not the Nicene creed, which he did not hear of till long after,]¹ *and not to change that which alone as received and heard I am disposed to accept as my creed*; not indeed that those things which are contained in the Creed agreed to at the synod of our Fathers are to be condemned as irreligiously and wickedly written, but because through the boldness of men they are used as a handle for objections . . . [and having added an intimation that one emendation leads to another, he proceeds thus:] *How much do I now admire thee, Lord Constantius our Emperor, for your blessed and religious resolve, who dost wish to know the faith ONLY ACCORDING TO THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE WRITTEN; and deservedly address yourself to those very declarations themselves of the only begotten of God, that your heart charged with the cares of empire may also be filled with the knowledge of the divine words. He who repudiates this is antichrist, and he who feigns it is anathema.*"²

¹ Regeneratus pridem et in episcopatu aliquantis per manens, fidem Nicænam nunquam nisi exsulaturus audivi. HIL. PICT. De Synod. § 91. Col. 1205. Ed. Bened.

² Quod hieme undoso mari observari a navigantibus maxime tutum est, ut naufragio deserviente, in portum ex quo solverant revertantur; vel incautis adolescentibus convenit, ut cum in tuenda domo sua, mores paternæ observantiæ transgressi, profusa libertate sua usi sunt, jam sub ipso amittendi patrimonii metu solus illis ad paternam consuetudinem necessarius et tutus

A passage more completely condemnatory of the views of Dr. Pusey and his party could hardly be penned. So far from telling us that the additions made to the Creed at Nice were derived through tradition from the oral teaching of the Apostles, he very pointedly intimates that it would have been better to have made no change at all in the Creed commonly received, and *he praises the Emperor for looking to Scripture alone for the faith.*

ATHANASIUS (fl. a. 326.)

From the Council of Nice we proceed to the writings of Athanasius, who is so confidently claimed by the Tractators as maintaining their views, that an appeal to some passages in his writings, by one who is now a prelate of our Church, against them, was thought worth only a contemptuous sneer.¹ Whether it was wise, or becoming, or suitable to their own proficiency in Patristical learning to assume such a tone, I leave the reader to judge. Certainly it would be most easy to retort, especially upon one who has so blundered in the signification of a *phrase of common occurrence*, as to have quoted a passage of Athanasius in a sense directly opposed to its obvious meaning;² but I shall do no more than bespeak from the reader an impartial consideration of the passages I am about to quote.

After explaining the doctrine relative to the Second

recursus sit; ita inter hæc fidei naufragia, cælestis patrimonii jam pæne profligata hæreditate, tutissimum nobis est, primam et solam evangelicam fidem confessam in baptismo intellectamque retinere, nec demutare quod solum acceptum atque auditum habeo bene credere: non ut ea, quæ synodo patrum nostrorum continentur, tamquam irreligiose et impie scripta damnanda sint, sed quia per temeritatem humanam usurpantur ad contradictionem . . . In quantum ego nunc beatæ religiosæque voluntatis vere te, Domine Constanti Imperator, admiror, fidem tantum secundum ea quæ scripta sunt desiderantem; et merito plane ad illa ipsa Unigeniti Dei eloquia festinans, ut imperatoriæ sollicitudinis capax pectus etiam divinorum dictorum conscientia plenum sit. Hoc qui repudiat, antichristus est; et qui simulat, anathema est. HILAR. PICTAV. Ad Constant. Aug. lib. ii. §§ 7, 8. Col. 1229, 30. Ed. Bened.

¹ See Review of Dr. Shuttleworth on Tradition, in the British Critic.

² See vol. i. pp. 73, 74.

Person in the sacred Trinity, Athanasius remarks,—
 “But these things, the whole inspired Scripture *teaches more clearly and fully; in reliance upon whose testimony, indeed, we also write these things to you; and you, if you read those Scriptures, may be certified of the truth of what I have said.*”¹

Words more clearly overthrowing the whole system of our opponents, could hardly be found.

Again, he says of the Arians, “If, therefore, they deny that which is in Scripture, they immediately deprive themselves of any right to the name of Christians, and may properly be called by all Atheists, and enemies of Christ; for this name they have thus given to themselves. But, if they confess with us that the words of Scripture are inspired, let them dare openly to say what they secretly think, that God was once without reason and without wisdom.”²

Is not Scripture plainly referred to here, as the rule of faith and judge of controversies in the matter in question?

And so, a little further on, (as, indeed, continually throughout his writings,) the Arians are blamed for “*not attending to the Scriptures.*”³ And of his own doctrine, he continually tells us that he *learned it from the Scriptures.*⁴

Nay, in the same treatise, he says (as already quoted), “Of these things we are certified, not from any external source, but *from the Scriptures.*”⁵

¹ Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ πᾶσα θεοπνευστος γραφή φανερωτερον καὶ κατὰ μείζον κηρυττει, ἀφ’ ὧν δὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τεθαρρηκότες ταῦτα σοὶ γραφομεν, καὶ σὺ ταῦταις ἐντυγχάνων δυνήσῃ τῶν λεγομένων εἶχειν τὴν πίστιν. ATHANASII Orat. contr. Gent. § 45. tom. i. p. 43. ed. Ben.

² Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀρνοῦνται τὰ γεγραμμένα, αὐτοθεν ἀλλοτριοὶ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος ὄντες, οἰκείως αὖ καλοῦντο καὶ παρὰ πάντων ἀθεοὶ καὶ χριστομαχοί· οὕτω γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς ἐπωνόμασαν καὶ αὐτοί. Εἰ δὲ συνομολογοῦσιν ἡμῖν εἶναι θεοπνευστά τὰ τῆς γραφῆς ῥήματα, τολμησάτωσαν φανερώς εἰπεῖν ἃ κεκρυμμένως φρονοῦσιν· ὅτι ἀλογὸς καὶ ἀσὸφος ἦν ὁ θεὸς ποτε. κ. τ. λ. ID. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 15. i. 221.

³ Τῶν γραφῶν ἀνηκοοὶ. ID. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 29. i. 235.

⁴ Μεμαθήκομεν ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν. ID. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 15. i. 220. See also § 21. p. 227. Et alibi passim.

⁵ ID. i. § 17. See p. 350, 351 above.

And so completely was Scripture the sole rule of faith, that even the use of a word not in Scripture, to define the faith, was objected to. "Perhaps," says Athanasius, "they will say, It behoves us also, with respect to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to *speak from the Scriptures those things which are written respecting him, and not to introduce phrases not to be found in the Scriptures.* IT DOES, INDEED, BEHOVE US SO TO DO, I SHOULD MYSELF ALSO SAY; *for the representations of the truth derived from the Scriptures, are much more exact than those derived from any other source*; but the perverseness, and artful, and versatile impiety of the Eusebians, compelled the bishops, as I before said, to set forth words more plainly subversive of their impiety; and those words which were written by the Council, have been proved to have a right sense."¹ Hence, in a passage already quoted, he says,—“To all created beings, and especially to us men, it is impossible to speak worthily of things which are beyond our power of expression; and it is still more audacious for those who cannot express them to *excogitate new words beyond those of the Scriptures.*”²

Hence, he says to the Arians,—“Let them tell us from what Scriptures they have learnt, or from which of the sacred writers they have heard the phrases which they have heaped together for themselves,—namely, ‘From things not existing;’ and, ‘He was not before he was begotten,’” &c.³

And when the Nicene Fathers entered upon their deliberations, their great desire and intention was, he tells us, to determine the controversy by “*words that were confessedly words of Scripture,*”⁴ and that they adopted the word “*consubstantial*” on the consideration that it was

¹ De decret. Nic. Syn. § 32. i. 237. See p. 351 above. Similar remarks occur, ib. § 28. i. 234.

² Id. Ep. 1. ad Serap. § 17. i. 666. See p. 13 above.

³ Εἰπαύσαν ἡμῖν ἐκ ποίων αὐτοὶ γραφῶν μαθόντες, ἢ παρὰ τίνος τῶν ἁγίων ἀκούσαντες, συμπεφορηκασιν ἑαυτοῖς ῥημῆα, το, ἐξ οὐκ οὐτῶν, καὶ, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆ, κ. τ. λ. Id. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 18. i. 223.

⁴ Id. Ad Afros Episc. Epist. § 5. i. 895. See p. 329 above.

merely equivalent to the expressions used in several passages of Scripture, which they collected together, in order to obtain the sense of Scripture on the doctrine in question.¹

And therefore he says further to the Arians,—“But if they again complain that these words are not in Scripture, let them be at once rejected as empty talkers, and of unsound mind. And for this they may blame themselves; inasmuch as they themselves first gave cause for the use of such phrases, when they began to fight against God, by words not in Scripture. But, nevertheless, let any one who wishes to know the truth, understand that, although the phrases do not literally exist in the Scriptures, yet, as has before been said, they have *the meaning that is derived from the Scriptures*; and when pronounced, convey this meaning to those whose ears are sound for piety.”²

How, in the face of these passages, the Tractators can have made such statements as they have respecting the way in which Athanasius and the Nicene Council arrived at the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son, and adopted the phrase “consubstantial,” is inconceivable.

And before I pass on, I would direct the attention of the reader to the direct mis-translation of the Benedictines of a passage just quoted, where the word I have translated “the sacred writers,” (των ἁγίων) meaning “the writers of Scripture,” is interpreted “the Fathers” (Patribus.) To any one at all acquainted with the phraseology of the Fathers, I need not add a word to show that this is a mis-translation; but, in a note below, I have given some references which will enable any one to judge.³

¹ Id. ib. § 6. i. 896. See p. 330 above.

² Εἰ δὲ ὅτι καὶ μὴ ἐγγράφοι εἰσι παλιν γογγυζουσιν, αὐτοθεν μὲν αὐτοὶ ἐκβαλεσθῶσαν ὡς κενολογούντες καὶ τὸν νοῦν οὐχ ὑγιαίνοντες· ἑαυτοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις αἰτιασθῶσαν, ὅτι πρῶτοι παρασχόντες τὴν τοιαύτην προφασιν, ἐξ ἀγραφῶν θεομαχείην ἤρξαντο. Γινώσκω δὲ ὅμως, εἰ τις ἐστὶ φιλομαθὴς, ὅτι εἰ καὶ μὴ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰσιν αἱ λέξεις, ἀλλὰ, καθάπερ εἰρητᾷ προτερον, τὴν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν διανοίαν ἐχουσί, καὶ ταύτην ἐκφώνουμένην σημαίνουσι τοῖς ἐχουσὶν εἰς εὐσεβίαν τὴν ἀκοὴν ὁλοκλήρῃ. Id. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 21. i. 226, 7.

³ Thus, in a passage in the same treatise but just preceding that quoted above, it is said, with reference to the writers of Scripture, Οὕτω γὰρ ἡμᾶς

Let us proceed, however, to other passages in the writings of Athanasius, illustrative of this question.

In his first Oration against the Arians, he says,—“If they should be suspected of such sentiments, they shall be overwhelmed by proofs from the Scriptures,”—not by the interpretation given to Scripture by tradition, but by “proofs from the Scriptures.”¹

Again: “This,” he says, “we must especially inquire, Whether he is Son; and respecting this, the Scriptures are before all things to be searched.”²

Again; “Where did they find that the counsel or will of God was before his Word; unless *neglecting the Scriptures* they deceitfully embrace the errors of Valentinus? Let them, if they please, defend the notions of Valentinus; but we, *having read the divine oracles*, have found it written respecting the Son, that ‘he was.’”³

Again; “Who delivered these doctrines to them? Who taught them these doctrines? No one, certainly, *from the Divine Scriptures*.”⁴ This testimony, though indirect, very forcibly shows how completely the Divine

οἱ ἅγιοι βουλευμενοι νοειν τοιαυτα και παραδειγματα δεδωκασι. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 12. i. 219. The phrase occurs also in the same sense in his treatise, De sent. Dionys. § 2. i. 244. And frequently in his Orations against the Arians, as Orat. i. § 63. i. 467. Orat. 2. § 5, i. 473. ib. § 6. i. 474. ib. § 63. i. 531. And elsewhere *passim*. And so the phrase is used continually by the other Fathers. As for instance Gregory Nyssen, Contra Eunom. orat. 9. ii. 254. ed. 1615. It is quite true that the word ἁγίων may sometimes be found connected with πατερων, in reference to the Nicene, or other Fathers; but the emphatic phrase, οἱ ἅγιοι, when applied to the writers of the Church, belongs peculiarly to the inspired writers.

¹ Εαν ὑπονοηθῶσι, βληθησονται παρὰ παντων τοις ἐκ των γραφων ἐλεγχοις. Id. Orat. i. contr. Arian. § 10. i. 414.

² Τουτο γαρ προ παντων δεῖ ζητειν, εἰ υἱος ἐστι, και περι τουτου τας γραφας προηγουμενωσ ερευναν. Id. Orat. 2. contr. Arian. § 73. i. 541.

³ Αυτοι δε που αρα βουλησιν η θελησιν προηγουμενην εὔρον του λογου του Θεου, εἰ μη αρα τας γραφας αφεντες, υποκρινονται και την Ουαλεντινου κακονοιαν; ἐκεινοι μεν ουν τα Ουαλεντινου ζηλευτῶσαν ἡμεῖς δε ἐντυχοντες τοις θειοις λογοις, ἐπὶ μεν του υἱου, το ην, εὔρομεν. Id. Orat. iii. contr. Arian. § 60. i. 608, 9.

⁴ Τis γαρ αυτοις παρεδωκε ταυτα; τις ὁ διδαξας; ἀλλ’ οὐδεὶς ἐκ των θειων γραφων. Id. Ep. 4. ad Serap. § 5. i. 700.

Scriptures were considered by Athanasius as the only source whence such doctrines should be taught.

Again ; “ Vainly, therefore, do they run about pretending that they demand that there should be councils held for the sake of the faith. For *the Divine Scripture is more competent* [to determine the faith] *than all other things.*”¹

Again ; “ Either, therefore, reject the Divine Scriptures, or, if you admit them, do not think to speak words of incurable deceit, *other than and beyond those that are written.*”²

Again ; “ If, therefore, ye are disciples of the Gospels, speak not injustice against God, but walk by those things that are written, and have been done. But if you wish to speak other things beyond those that are written, why do you contend against us, *who can endure neither to hear or speak anything beyond the things that are written* What enormous folly is this of yours to speak *things that are not written?*”³

And, in the Fragment of his Festal Epistle, after having enumerated the books of the Old and New Testament, he adds,—“ These are *the wells of salvation*, that he who thirsts may be filled with the oracles contained in these books. *In these alone the doctrine of religion is taught.* Let no one add to them, nor take away anything from them.”⁴

¹ Ματην γουν περιτρεχοντες προφασιζονται δια πιστιν ηξιικεναι γενεσθαι τας συνοδους. Εστι μεν γαρ ικανωτερα παντων η θεια γραφη. Id. De Synod. § 6. i. 720.

² Η τοιουν αρησασθε τας θειας γραφας, η ταντας ομολογουντες, μη ετερα παρα τα γεγραμμενα επινοειτε λαλειν βηματα απατης ανιατου. Id. Contr. Apoll. lib. i. § 6. i. 926.

³ Ει τοιουν μαθηται εστε των ευαγγελιων, μη λαλειτε κατα του Θεου αδικιαν· αλλα στοιχειτε τοις γεγραμμενοις και γενομενοις. Ει δε ετερα παρα τα γεγραμμενα λαλειν βουλευσθε, τι προς ημας διαμαχεσθε, τους μητε ακουειν, μητε λεγειν, παρα τα γεγραμμενα πειθομενους ; Τis υμων η τοσαντη απονοια της αμετριας, λαλειν τα μη γεγραμμενα ; Id. Contr. Apoll. lib. i. §§ 8, 9, i. 928, 9.

⁴ Ταυτα πηγαι του σωτηριου, ωστε τον διψωντα των εν τουτοις εμφορεισθαι λογιων· εν τουτοις μονοις το της ευσεβειας διδασκαλειον ευαγγελιζεται. Μηδεις τουτοις επιβαλλετω, μηδε τουτων αφαιρεισθω τι. Fragm. ex Epist. Fest. i. 962.

Lastly, I would recall to the remembrance of the reader a passage already quoted in a former page,¹ which, however, occurs in a treatise that is classed by the Benedictines among those of doubtful authorship, and with which, therefore, the reader may deal as he pleases.²

Moreover, Athanasius distinctly recognizes the *completeness* of Scripture as the rule of faith.

“As you desire,” he says, on one occasion to a person to whom he was writing, “to hear something on this subject, we will, as far as we are able, give a brief exposition of the Christian faith; which, indeed, you might have found from the divine oracles; but, nevertheless, politely hear also from others. For, indeed, the holy and inspired Scriptures are sufficient of themselves for the delivery of the truth.”³

Again; in the passage which has been so misquoted by Mr. Newman, he bears a similar testimony in the very words which have been cited against us. “I have written these things, beloved; although, indeed, there was no need to write anything more, for the *Evangelical tradition is sufficient of itself*; but because you inquired respecting our faith, and on account of those who love to make sport with the faith by their inventions, and do not consider that he who speaks from his own private fancies, speaks a lie. For it is not possible for the wit of man to declare

¹ See vol. i. p. 70.

² The passage in the original is as follows:—Επει τοινυν ηκουσαμεν παρ' υμιν τινας ταρπτεσθαι και ζητειν γραμματα παρ' ημων περι της κοινης και εξ αποστολων εισαχθεισης πιστεως, γραφομεν, οτι την μεν ακριβειαν αυτης επιζητειν ολιγων εστι, την δε πιστιν κατεχειν, απαντων των προς τον Θεον ευπειθων, οι και μεγαλλον επαινον αποφερονται της επιθυμιας. Ο μεν γαρ ζητων τα υπερ εαυτον, επικινδυνος· ο δε τοις παραδοθεισιν εμμενων, ακινδυνος. Παραινουμεν δε υμιν, υπερ και εαυτοις παραινουμεν, την παραδοθεισαν πιστιν φυλαττειν, εκτρεπεσθαι δε τας βεβηλους καινοφωνιας, και τουτο πασι παρεγγυαν φοβεισθαι την περι του τηλικαντου μυστηριου ζητησιν· ομολογειν δε, οτι πεφανερωται Θεος εν σαρκι, κατα την αποστολικην παραδοσιν. *Id. De incarn. Verbi Dei. § 2. tom. ii. p. 34.*

³ Ποθουντι δε σοι δμως τα περι ταυτης ακουσαι, φερε, ω μακαριε, ως αν οιοι τε ωμεν, ολιγα της κατα Χριστον πιστεως εκθωμεθα, δυναμενω μεν σοι και απο των θειων λογιων ταυτην ευρειν, φιλοκαλως δε δμως και παρ' ετερων ακουοντι. Αυταρ-κεις μεν γαρ εισιν αι αγiai και θεοπνευστοι γραφai προς την της αληθειας απα-γελιαν. *Id. Orat. contr. Gent. § 1. i. 1.*

fully the beauty or glory of the body of Christ. But it is possible for us both to confess the things that have been done, *according as they are recorded in Scripture*, and to worship the true God.”¹

And, as it respects its full delivery of particular doctrines, we have clear testimonies in Athanasius affirmative of this, in both the doctrines which his writings were more particularly intended to support, namely, the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father (as we have seen in the passages but just now quoted), and that of the divinity of the Holy Spirit; respecting which he says, “Let not any one any longer ask such questions, but *learn only what is in the Scriptures; for the illustrations we have of this matter in them, are sufficient of themselves, and need no addition.*”²

From these passages, then, I suppose we may conclude that, in Athanasius’s view, Scripture was the sole and entire rule of faith; tradition forming no part of it, either as adding doctrines to those there revealed, or as *interpretative* of the revelation there made.

But, as some passages are adduced both by the Romanists and the Tractators, as if they affirmed their views, we will consider them before we proceed further. Some of these passages we have formerly noticed; and for them, therefore, refer the reader to what has been already said respecting them.³ Others are quoted, through a mistaken view of the meaning of the phrases used; and the rest imply no more than what we willingly allow, that the Fathers, like ourselves, referred to the testimony of those who preceded them, in confirmation of the truth of their doctrines.

¹ Ταυτα εγραψα, αγαπητε· καν οτι μαλιστα ουδεν πλεον εδει γραφειν αυταρκης γαρ η ευαγγελικη παραδοσις· αλλ’ επειδη ηρωτησας περι της εν ημιν πιστεως, και ενεκα γε των ερεσχελειν βουλομενωνται εφευρεσεις, και ου λογιζομενων, οτι ο εκ των ιδιων λαλων το ψευδος λαλει. Ουτε γαρ καλλος, ουτε δοξαν σωματος Χριστου εφικτον διανοια ανθρωπου εξειπειν. Αλλα γε και τα γενομενα, ως γεγραπται, δημολογειν, και τον οντα Θεον προσκυνειν, κ. τ. λ. ID. Contr. Apoll. lib. i. § ult. i. 939, 40.

² ID. Ep. i. ad Serap. § 19. i. 667. See p. 13 above.

³ See vol. i. pp. 66 et seq.; and pp. 348—50 above.

Thus Mr. Keble quotes, as supporting his view of tradition, the passage in the Second Epistle to Serapion, in which Athanasius, laying down what he calls the form or outline (χαρακτηρ) of the faith in Christ, says, "This form comes from the Apostles, through the Fathers."¹ But, in the first place, the Fathers here mentioned are, as will be seen by a reference to the context, the Nicene Fathers,² a sense in which the word is continually used by Athanasius,³ not "the Fathers," in Mr. Keble's sense of the phrase, as indicating the catholic consent of all from the beginning. This is a mistake, we have already had occasion to point out in another passage, quoted both by Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble, where the context alike shows the error.⁴ Moreover, the passage only states a fact which we are far from questioning, and far from reckoning a poor argument for that which is so confirmed, namely, that the doctrine in question was taught by many bishops of the primitive church. But Athanasius neither here nor anywhere else, makes their testimony part of the rule of faith. And as to Mr. Keble's notion that this passage shows us that Athanasius held that, for "the form of the faith in Christ," we must go to the Fathers, as if it was not as fully and clearly delivered in the Scriptures, it is altogether overthrown by a passage in a fragment of a Letter to the Monks, in which Athanasius, speaking on the very same point, says,—“I might also have considerably extended my letter, by subjoining the form of such doctrine *from the Divine Scriptures*.”⁵

The appeal which Athanasius makes in the above, and other passages, is not to the "Catholic consent" of all the

¹ Ὁ μὲν χαρακτήρ οὗτος ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων διὰ τῶν πατέρων. Id. Ep. 2, ad Serap. § 8. i. 688. See Keble's Serm. App. pp. 124, 5.

² Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πατέρες νοήσαντες, ὡμολόγησαν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν συνοδῷ, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. § 5. i. 686.

³ See De Synod. § 6. i. 720. B. Ep. ad Jovian. §§ 1, 2. *passim*. i. 780, 781. De incarn. Dom. contr. Apoll. lib. i. §§ 1, 2. i. 922.

⁴ See vol. i. pp. 71, 72.

⁵ Possibile quidem erat mihi etiam per multa extendere epistolam, apponenti ex Scripturis divinis *formam* ejusmodi doctrinæ, &c. Ep. ad Mon. i. 967.

Fathers, as a “divine informant,” and part of the rule of faith, but to the testimony of certain Fathers, whose suffrage he justly considers as a confirmatory argument in favour of his doctrine.

And his words have the same meaning in several other passages, which are often quoted against our views; as the context will at once show.

Again; after having quoted *four* of the preceding Fathers in defence of the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, he says,—“Lo, we give you proof that this doctrine has passed down from Fathers to Fathers; but you, ye new Jews and disciples of Caiaphas, what Fathers have you to show as supporters of your phrases? You could name none of the prudent and wise. For all abhor you, except the devil only.”¹ Now, this language is sufficiently violent, especially when we recollect that one of the four, to whom he appealed, was Origen, who was subsequently condemned by the majority of the Church for opposing the doctrine, which Athanasius here quotes him as maintaining; and that Jerome admits that many of the earlier writers had spoken erroneously on the point; but, nevertheless, all that it amounts to is, that certain of the Fathers had maintained the doctrine, and that he did not believe that Arius could produce any such authority for his views; and consequently that besides the Scripture proof, he had a strong argument from antiquity in favour of the doctrine. But what then? We are far from denying the successional preaching of the orthodox doctrine in the Church, or that the indications of that delivery contained in the writings of the Fathers, are an important confirmation of the true faith. Nay, we think that in the case of any fundamental doctrine, it would be absurd to suppose that all the writers of the primitive Church should have erred; and therefore that, con-

¹ Ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐκ πατέρων εἰς πατέρας διαβεβηκεναι τὴν τοιαύτην διανοίαν ἀποδεικνυμένῃ· ὑμεῖς δὲ, ὡ νεοὶ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ τοῦ Καίφα μαθηταί, τίνας ἀρὰ τῶν βιβλιαίων ὑμῶν ἐχετε δεῖξαι πατέρας; ἀλλ’ οὐδὲνα τῶν φρονιμῶν καὶ σοφῶν αὐ εἰποῖτε, πάντες γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἀποστρεφονται, πλὴν μονοῦ τοῦ διαβόλου. De Decret. Nic. Syn. §. 27. i. 233.

sidering the number of writings that remain to us of the first four or five centuries, it is but reasonable to require that any doctrine put forth as fundamental, should have some support in those writings. And therefore we quite agree with Athanasius in his remark respecting the Arians,—“If they *confess* that they have *now first* heard these things, let them not deny that this heresy is foreign [to the Church], and not from Fathers. But that which is not from Fathers, but *invented now*, what else can it be, but that of which the blessed Paul foretold, ‘In the last times some shall depart from the sound faith,’ &c.”¹ The truth of this, few, I suppose, will deny.

But where, I ask, is it intimated in these, or any other passages of Athanasius, that the testimony of a few Fathers is to be taken as an adequate proof and representation of Catholic consent for several centuries, infallibly conveying to us the oral teaching of the Apostles; and giving us a revelation of divine truth, more full and clear than what we have in Scripture; and thus forming part of the rule of faith? No; on the contrary, the writings of Athanasius clearly and abundantly show (as we have seen) that he considered Scripture the sole and entire rule of faith; yes, and the source from which all were to certify themselves of the faith, for he says,—“The true and pious faith in the Lord hath stood forth evident *to all*, being known and read out of the divine Scriptures.”²

In fact, of *tradition*, in the sense in which the Romanists and the Tractators use the term, namely, as something coming to us from the *oral* teaching of the Apostles, above and beyond Scripture, through a successional delivery by all the Fathers, we meet with not one syllable in the writings of Athanasius.

¹ Εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ πρῶτον νῦν ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀκηκοέναι τὰ τοιαῦτα, μὴ ἀρνεισθῶσαν ἀλλοτρίαν καὶ μὴ ἐκ πατέρων εἶναι τὴν αἵρεσιν ταύτην. Το δὲ μὴ ἐκ πατέρων, ἀλλὰ νῦν εφευρέθεν, τί ἂν εἴη ἕτερον ἢ περὶ οὗ προεῖρηκεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος· ἐν ὑστεροῖς καιροῖς ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς ὑγιαίνουσας πίστεως, κ. τ. λ. ID. Orat. 1. contr. Arian. § 8. i. 412.

² ID. Ep. ad Jovian. § 1. i. 780. See p. 349 above.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM. (fl. a. 350.)

I proceed to Cyril of Jerusalem, and offer to the reader the following extracts from his Catechetical Lectures to those about to be baptized.

First, as it respects Scripture being the sole authoritative rule of faith.

After giving a brief account of the principal articles of the Christian faith, he says,—“ Retain this seal ever in thy mind, the principal points of which have now been briefly enumerated. But if the Lord permit, they shall be discussed, as far as I am able, with Scripture proof. For, as it respects the divine and holy mysteries of the faith, *not even the least point ought to be delivered without the divine Scriptures*, nothing asserted nakedly without proof, by probable reasoning and oratorical statements. Nay, you must not believe me, when I declare these things to you nakedly without proof, if you do not receive the proof of the things spoken from the Divine Scriptures.”¹

To see the full force of this passage, we must recollect that it is addressed to the young, to those about to be baptized; and to *them* it is said by Cyril that they were not to believe him, but so far as they should find him to be borne out by the declarations of Scripture; so far is he from asserting that the interpretation of Scripture which he gave, was binding upon the conscience, and the proper object of faith. And, moreover, this is said with reference to *the creed*, which is emphatically put forward by the Tractators as part of the rule of faith, and a divine revelation, quite independent of Scripture.

Again, he says,—“ There is need truly of spiritual

¹ Ταυτην εχε την σφραγιδα εν τη διανοια σου παντοτε, ητις νυν μεν κατα ανακεφαλαιωσιν ακροθιγως ειρηται. Ει δε παρασχοι ο Κυριος, μετα της των γραφων αποδειξεως κατα δυναμιν βηθησεται. Δει γαρ περι των θειων και αγιων της πιστεως μυστηριων, μηδε το τυχον ανευ των θειων παραδιδοςθαι γραφων, μηδε απλως πιθανοτητι και λογων κατωσκευαις παραφερεσθαι. Μηδε εμοι τω ταυτα σοι λεγοντι απλως πιστευσης, εαν την αποδειξιν των καταγγελλομενων απο των θειων μη λαβης γραφων. CYRILL. HIEROSOL. Catech. 4. § 12. (Ed. Milles. Oxon. 1702. p. 56.)

grace, that we may discourse of the Holy Spirit. Not that we may speak worthily of the subject, for that is impossible; but that speaking the things which we *learn from the Divine Scriptures*, we may proceed without danger."¹

He knew nothing of an infallible interpretation of Scripture, derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles, and handed down by "tradition."

Further; as to the perfection of Scripture. He says,— "What else is there that knows the deep things of God, but only the Holy Spirit that uttered the Divine Scriptures? But neither hath the Holy Spirit himself spoken in the Scriptures concerning the generation of the Son from the Father. Why, therefore, do you curiously inquire after that which the Holy Spirit hath not written in the Scriptures? Do you, who know not what is written, curiously inquire after that which is not written? There are many subjects for inquiry in the Divine Scriptures, [and] we do not fully comprehend that which is written, why do we curiously inquire after what is not written?"²

Again; "Therefore let those things be spoken by us concerning the Holy Spirit which are written. And if anything is not written, let us not curiously inquire after it. The Holy Spirit himself hath uttered the Scriptures, and *hath himself spoken concerning himself as much as he pleased, and as much as we are capable of receiving*. Therefore let those things be spoken which he has uttered; for what he hath not spoken, we dare not speak."³

¹ Πνευματικῆς ἀληθῶς χρεια τῆς χάριτος, ἵνα περὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου διαλεχθῶμεν· οὐχ ἵνα κατ' ἀξίαν εἰπωμεν· ἀδύνατον γὰρ· ἀλλ' ἵνα τὰ ἀπο τῶν θείων γραφῶν εἰποντες ἀκινδύνως διελθῶμεν. *Id.* Cat. 16. § 1. p. 223.

² Τι ἐστὶν ἕτερον γινώσκον τὰ βαθὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ μὴ μόνον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον το λαλήσαν τὰς θείας γραφάς· ἀλλ' οὐδ' αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ τῆς ἐκ Πατρὸς τοῦ Ὑίου γεννήσεως ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ἐλάλησεν. Τι τοίνυν πολυπραγμονεῖς, ἂ μὴδε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐγράψεν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς; ὃ τὰ γεγραμμένα μὴ γινώσκων, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα πολυπρᾶγμανοι; Πολλὰ ζητήματα ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς, τὸ γεγραμμένον οὐ καταλαμβάνομεν, τι τὸ μὴ γεγραμμένον πολυπρᾶγμανομεν; *Id.* Cat. 11. § 4. pp. 140, 1.

³ Λεγέσθω τοίνυν ὑφ' ἡμῶν περὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὰ γεγραμμένα. Εἰ δὲ τι μὴ γεγραπται, μὴ πολυπρᾶγμανωμεν. Αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησε τὰς γραφάς· αὐτὸ καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκεν ὅσα ἐβούλετο, καὶ ὅσα ἐχώρουμεν· λεγέσθω οὖν ἂ εἰρηκεν· ὅσα γὰρ οὐκ εἰρηκεν ἡμεῖς οὐ τολμῶμεν. *Id.* Cat. 16. § 1. p. 224.

Again; "It is sufficient for us to know these things. But as to nature or hypostasis, do not curiously search into it. For, if it was written, we would declare it. It is not written, let us not dare to do so. It is sufficient for our salvation, to know that there is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."¹

Again; "Not using, even to-day, human imaginations, for that would be unprofitable; but *only* PUTTING YOU IN MIND OF *those things which we learn from the Divine Scriptures*; for that is the safest; according to the blessed Apostle, who says, 'which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual.'"²

But it may be said, (for it *has* been said by those who would fain make us believe that every passage in the Fathers, in which the word *tradition* (παράδοσις) is mentioned with favour, is a support to the views we are opposing,) that Cyril says, in another place, "Be careful, therefore, brethren, and hold fast *the traditions* which ye now receive . . . God will require of you an account of the deposit committed to your keeping."³ True; and what does he mean by these "*traditions*"? Let his own words in the previous context explain,—“Hold fast the faith [or, creed] both in knowledge and profession, and keep it; that only, I mean, which is now *delivered* (*tradited*) to thee by the Church, and which is established from the whole Scripture;”⁴ and of this creed he adds, “The articles of

¹ Καὶ ἀνταρκές ἡμῖν εἶδεναι ταῦτα· φύσιν δὲ ἡ ὑπόστασιν μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖ· εἰ γὰρ ἡν γεγραμμένον, ἐλεγόμεν' οὐ γεγράφται, μὴ τολμῆσωμεν' ἀνταρκές ἡμῖν εἶδεναι πρὸς σωτηρίαν ὅτι ἐστὶ πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. ID. Cat. 16, § 12. pp. 236, 7.

² Οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνους καὶ σημερίον κεχρημένοι σοφισμασιν, ἀσυμφορὸν γὰρ· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μόνον ὑπομιμνήσκοντες, ἀσφαλεστάτον γὰρ· κατὰ τὸν μακαρίον Ἀποστόλον, ὅς καὶ φησιν· ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν, οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς Πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρινόντες. ID. Cat. 17. § 1. p. 241.

³ Βλέπετε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις, ἃς νῦν παραλαμβάνετε . . . Θεὸς δὲ παρ' ὑμῶν αἰτᾷ τῆς παρακαταθήκης τοὺς λόγους. ID. Cat. 5. § 8. p. 76.

⁴ Πιστὶν δὲ ἐν μαθήσει καὶ ἐπαγγελίᾳ κτῆσαι καὶ τηρήσον, μόνην τὴν ὑπο τῆς ἐκκλησίας νυνὶ σοὶ παραδιδομένην, τὴν ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς οὐκ ὠρωμένην. ID. Cat. 5. § 7. p. 75.

the creed were not, as it appears, composed by men ; but the most suitable passages collected together out of the whole Scripture, make up one form of instruction in the faith. And as a grain of mustard seed contains, in a small grain, many branches, thus, also, the creed itself embraces, in a few words, the whole knowledge of religion revealed to us in the Old and New Testament. Be careful, therefore, and hold fast the *traditions*, &c.”¹ These *traditions*, therefore, were the articles of the creed ; which articles were expressed in language carefully taken from Scripture ; the creed being a collection of suitable passages selected from the whole Scripture, to give a brief and comprehensive view of the principal points of the Christian faith. The word “traditions,” therefore, is here evidently merely equivalent to “instructions;” or at least has not the meaning in which the Tractators use the word “traditions.”

The translation and comment given by Mr. Newman to the above passage, are worthy of notice. He translates it thus ; “*Learn and hold fast thy faith in what is taught and promised ; that faith which alone is now delivered to thee BY TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH, and established from Scripture.*”² And he quotes it as showing that Cyril “distinguishes between Tradition as *teaching*, and Scripture as *proving, verifying* doctrine.”

Upon the various errors in the translation of these few lines, I say nothing ; but to its bad faith, in the introduction of the phrase, “*traditions of the Church,*” I cannot but call the attention of the reader. The passage is merely a request by Cyril to his hearers, to attend to that which the Church, through him, was *delivering* to

¹ Ου γαρ ὡς ἐδοξεν ἀνθρώποις συνετεθῆ τα τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ’ ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς τα καιριωτάτα συλλεχθέντα, μιαν ἀναπληροῖ τὴν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν. Καὶ ὑπερ τροπὸν ὁ τοῦ σινάπεως σπόρος ἐν μικρῷ κοκκῷ πολλοὺς περιέχει τοὺς κλάδους, οὕτω καὶ ἡ πίστις αὕτη ἐν ὀλίγοις βήμασι πύσαν τὴν ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ καὶ καινῇ τῆς εὐσεβείας γνῶσιν ἐγκεκκοπισται. Βλέπετέ οὖν, ἀδελφοί, κ. τ. λ. *ut supra*. *Id.* Cat. 5. §§. 7, 8. p. 76.

² Lect. pp. 385, 6.

them as the Christian faith. And there is not one word about "Tradition" teaching. And what possible advantage could Mr. Newman's cause gain by it, if there was; when Cyril himself cautions his hearers not to believe one word he was about to say, but as they should see it to be proved by Scripture? The sole question is, whether there is any authoritative teaching, forming part of the rule of faith, but Scripture; and Cyril here expressly affirms the negative. That patristical tradition, or the instruction of the Fathers, teaches, and teaches the true faith, and that the ministers of the Church teach the faith, and the Church through them, is all perfectly true; and that they teach it from Scripture, and refer their hearers to Scripture, as Cyril does here, to *test* their instructions, and see that they teach the true faith, is equally true. But what then? Does that avail Mr. Newman's cause? No; the only thing that would serve his cause, would be a statement that the oral teaching of the Apostles had been perpetuated, by a successional delivery, from one to another in the Church, and is still to us the *authoritative* interpreter of Scripture, *teaching* us its meaning with sovereign *authority*, and forming part of the rule of faith, under the name of "Tradition;" in which sense, chiefly, the word "Tradition" has been used by the moderns, and is exclusively applied by the Tractators. And to make the Fathers appear to intimate this, Mr. Newman translates the words "delivered to thee by the Church," thus—"delivered to thee by *traditions* of the Church;" thereby deceiving both himself and others. For Cyril himself tells us that the articles delivered, were gathered from the Scriptures. They were not, therefore, *traditions* in that technical sense of the word in which the Tractators use it. And, as it often happens in such cases, Mr. Newman's cause would gain nothing by his mis-translation, *when it came to be compared with the context*; for, if it had been correct, the context would only have testified the more strongly in condemnation of his views of the authority of "Traditions."

HILARY OF POICTIERS. (fl. a. 354.)

I proceed to the excellent Hilary of Poitiers, whose writings deserve more attention than they have received.

"No one," saith Hilary, "ought to doubt that, for the knowledge of divine things, we must use the divine instructions Therefore, in opposition to the wicked and impious instructions that are given respecting God, we follow the authoritative testimonies themselves of the divine words."¹

These words, undeniably spoken with reference to Scripture, clearly prove that Hilary recognized no other divine informant but Scripture; and hence considered Scripture the sole authoritative rule in matters of faith.

. Again; "How much do we stand in need of God's grace, that we may entertain correct views, and *from the Prophetical and Evangelical authorities*, maintain one and the same doctrine!"² This passage appears to me particularly forcible in proof of Scripture being looked to by Hilary as the sole rule of faith; and that he considered unity of view in its correct interpretation, to flow, not from "tradition," but from "God's grace," enlightening the mind, and enabling it to *receive* the truth.

Again; "When the discourse shall relate to the things of God, let us grant to God the knowledge of himself, and wait upon his words with pious veneration;"³ where, by *the words of God*, he evidently means Scripture.

Again; "We are compelled, by the follies of heretics and blasphemers, to do that which is not lawful, to climb up to things beyond our reach, to speak clearly of things

¹ Nemini dubium esse oportet, ad divinarum rerum cognitionem divinis utendum esse doctrinis Sequimur ergo adversus irreligiosos et impios de Deo institutiones, ipsas illas divinarum dictorum auctoritates. HILARI PICTAV. De Trin. lib. 4. § 14. col. 835. Ed. Bened. Par. 1693.

² Quanta opus est nobis Dei gratia, ut recta sapiamus, ut ex prophetiis atque evangelicis auctoritatibus unum idemque teneamus. IDEM. Tract. in Ps. 118. [119 apud nos] Litt. i. § 12. col. 249.

³ Cum de rebus Dei erit sermo, concedamus cognitionem sui Deo, dictisque ejus pia veneratione famulemur. Id. De Trin. lib. I. § 18. col. 777.

that are ineffable, to assume a knowledge of things not revealed. And when it became us to fulfil the things that are commanded us by a simple faith, namely, to adore the Father, and venerate with him the Son, and abound in the Holy Spirit, we are obliged to stretch the meanness of our discourse to those things that are unspeakable, and are forced into an act of folly, by the folly of others ; so that those things that ought to have been only matters of religious contemplation, are now exposed to the danger of human language [which can but imperfectly express them]. For there have been many who were resolved to understand the plain declarations of the heavenly oracles, in the meaning which their own wishes dictated, not with a simple regard to truth ; *interpreting them differently to what the force of the words demanded.* For heresy is derived from the meaning given to Scripture, *not from Scripture* Their unbelief, therefore, draws us into a position of doubt and danger, rendering it necessary to produce, respecting things so great and recondite, something *beyond the heavenly rule.* The Lord had said that the nations were to be baptized ‘in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.’ The form of the faith is certain ; but as far as the heretics are concerned the whole sense is uncertain. Nothing, therefore, is to be added to the [divine] precepts, but a limit is to be assigned to human audacity ; that since the malignity that has been roused at the instigation of diabolical deceit eludes the truth of things through the names of nature, we may show the nature and meaning of the names ; and the dignity and office of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit being set forth, as far as words will enable us so to do, the names may not be defrauded of what belongs to their nature, but at the same time may by the force of the names be restrained within the limits of the signification that belongs to their nature But that which is required is vast, that of which we are to make free to speak is incomprehensible, that we should discourse respecting God beyond what God has declared. He has laid

down the names of nature, Father, Son, Holy Spirit. Whatever is inquired beyond this is beyond the power of language to express, beyond what sense can reach, beyond what the mind can conceive ; it is not expressed, it is not reached, it is not understood by us . . . But we humbly praying for pardon for yielding to this necessity from him who is all these, will venture, will inquire, will speak ; and (which alone we promise in so vast a question) will believe those things which shall be made known to us." ¹

In this remarkable passage we see that Hilary, far from supposing that he had an infallible guide in patristical tradition, or anything else, conveying to him the doctrine of the Trinity more fully or clearly than it is revealed in Scripture, trembles at the thought of endeavouring to add anything to what Scripture says respecting it.

¹ Compellimur hæreticorum et blasphemantium vitiis illicita agere, ardua scandere, ineffabilia eloqui, inconcessa præsumere. Et cum sola fide expleri quæ præcepta sunt oporteret, adorare videlicet Patrem, et venerari cum eo Filium, sancto Spiritu abundare, cogimur sermonis nostri humilitatem ad ea quæ inenarrabilia sunt extendere, et in vitium vitio coartamur alieno ; ut quæ contineri religione mentium opportuissent, nunc in periculum humani eloquii proferantur. Exstiterunt enim plures qui cælestium verborum simplicitatem pro voluntatis suæ sensu non pro veritatis ipsius absolutione susceperent, aliter interpretantes quam dictorum virtus postularet. De intelligentia enim hæresis non de Scriptura est Horum igitur infidelitas in anceps nos ac periculum protrahit, ut necesse sit de tantis ac tam reconditis rebus aliquid ultra præscriptum cæleste proferre. Dixerat Dominus baptizandas gentes 'in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.' Forma fidei certa est ; sed quantum ad hæreticos omnis sensus incertus est. Ergo non præceptis aliquid addendum est, sed modus est constituendus audaciæ ; ut quia malignitas instinctu diaboliciæ fraudulentæ excitata veritatem rerum per naturæ nomina eludit, nos naturam nominum proferamus ; et editis, prout in verbis habebimus, dignitate atque officio Patris Filii Spiritus Sancti, non frustrentur naturæ proprietatibus nomina, sed intra naturæ significationem nominibus coartentur Immensum est autem quod exigitur, incomprehensibile est quod audetur, ut ultra præfinitionem Dei sermo de Deo sit. Posuit naturæ nomina, Patrem, Filium, Spiritum Sanctum. Extra significantiam sermonis est, extra sensus intentionem, extra intelligentiæ conceptionem, quidquid ultra quæritur ; non enuntiat, non attingitur, non tenetur Sed nos necessitatis hujus ab eo, qui hæc omnia est, veniam deprecantes, audebimus, quæremus, loquemur ; et quod solum in tanta rerum quæstione promittimus ea quæ erunt significata credemus. *Id. ib. lib. ii. §§ 2, 3, 5. col. 788—91.*

Again; speaking of the true faith as just explained by him, he says, "This is the catholic and apostolical confession *derived from the gospels.*"¹

Again; he tells us that "with respect to all things, he believed only what had been said by God respecting them;"² adding a little further on,—"Let us understand that that only ought to be believed respecting God for the belief of which concerning himself he himself is both the witness and author."³ Nay, "We must not," he says, "speak otherwise respecting God than as he himself hath spoken concerning himself to our apprehension."⁴ And, "For the discourses of man concerning the things of God, God's words only are left to us."⁵

Again; he says,—“Either there are other gospels to be produced to teach us, or if *these only have taught us* respecting God, why do we not believe these things as we are there taught? But if our knowledge is taken from *these only*, why is not our faith derived thence whence our knowledge is derived?”⁶

To the Scripture also he directs us to go to confute heretics.

"Above all things," he says, "we hasten to confound their madness and ignorance from the Prophetical and Evangelical declarations."⁷ "I am of opinion that we

¹ Hæc de Evangeliiis catholica et apostolica confessio est. Id. ib. § 22. col. 799.

² Mihi . . . tantum de omnibus Deo ut sunt ab eo dicta credenti. Id. ib. lib. iii. § 20. col. 818.

³ Hoc solum de Deo bene credi intelligamus, ad quod de se credendum ipse sibi nobiscum et testis et auctor existat. Id. ib. § 26. col. 824.

⁴ Loquendum non aliter de Deo est, quam ut ipse ad intelligentiam nostram de se locutus est. Id. ib. lib. v. § 21. col. 866.

⁵ Non relictus est hominum eloquiis de Dei rebus alius præter quam Dei sermo. Id. lib. vii. § 38. col. 941.

⁶ Aut enim alia sunt Evangelia proferenda quæ doceant, aut si de Deo sola ista docuerunt, cur non ita credimus ut docemur? Quod si ex his tantum sumta cognitio est, cur non exinde fides sit unde cognitio? Id. ib. lib. vii. § 22. col. 930.

⁷ Maxime ergo properamus ex prophetiis atque evangelicis præconiis vesaniam eorum ignorantiamque confundere. Id. De Trin. lib. i. § 17. col. 776.

must reply to the perverseness of the heretics and confute all their foolish and deadly instructions *by Evangelical and Apostolical testimonies*. For they appear to themselves to give a reason for everything which they assert, inasmuch as they have attached to each of their assertions some testimonies from the divine volumes, which, being perverted from their true meaning, please only the ignorant, and give the appearance of truth only from the pravity of the interpreters. . . . When about to answer each of their propositions, and betray the unsoundness of their impious doctrine *by the testimonies of the divine oracles*, we ought, &c.”¹ And having adduced his proofs from Scripture, he says, “Hence, O wicked heretic, you may be confuted by Apostolical, by Evangelical, by Prophetical testimonies.”² Here, then, we see that on the very ground on which the Tractators plead for the necessity of “tradition,” and declare that heretics can be confuted only by “tradition,” namely, that heretics plead Scripture in their favour, on that very same ground Hilary tells us that we must go to Scripture to confute them. He knew nothing, then, of our opponents’ notion that as long as we keep to Scripture only, heretics have a *reasonable* foundation to rest their errors upon.

Lastly, he thus addresses the Emperor Constantius;—“Truly do I admire thee, Lord Constantius our Emperor, *desirous of believing only according to what is delivered in the Scriptures*; and with justice evidently hastening to those very words themselves of the only begotten God, that

¹ Respondendum esse existimo hæreticorum perversitati, et omnes eorum stultas ac mortiferas institutiones evangelicis atque apostolicis testimoniis coarguendas. Videntur enim sibi de singulis quæ asserunt præstare rationem, quia singulis assertionibus suis quædam ex divinis voluminibus testimonia subdiderunt, quæ corrupto intelligentiæ sensu solis tantum ignorantibus blandiantur, speciem veritatis secundum pravitatem interpretantium præstatura. . . . Responsuri singulis eorum propositionibus, et divinorum dictorum testimoniis irreligiosam eorum doctrinam prodituri, debemus, &c. Id. ib. lib. iv. §§ 7, 11. col. 830, 832.

² Hinc apostolicis, hinc evangelicis, hinc propheticis dictis, impie hæretice, concluderis. Id. lib. v. § 33. col. 873.

your breast though filled with royal cares may also be filled with the knowledge of the divine words. He who repudiates this is antichrist; and he who feigns it is anathema. . . . You seek the faith, O Emperor: *hear it, not from new writings, but from God's books.* . . . Remember, nevertheless, that there is not one of the heretics who does not now falsely affirm that he follows the Scriptures when preaching his blasphemies *Hear, THEN, I entreat you, those things that are written concerning Christ, lest under them those things that are not written be preached.* Incline your ears to those things which I am about to utter from those books; rouse your faith towards God. Hear what avails for faith, for unity, for eternity." ¹

A more pointed and express condemnation of the views of the Tractators could not be uttered; and here again we see, that the very fact that the heretics pretended to Scripture authority in their favour, formed, in Hilary's view, a decisive reason in itself for going to Scripture to ascertain the faith, and taking it only upon Scripture testimony.

And this passage shows us that Hilary looked to Scripture for *the whole* faith; as he states also still more strongly elsewhere.

"Those things," he says, "which are not contained in the book of the law, we ought not even to be acquainted with." ²

¹ Vere te, Domine Constanti Imperator, admiror, fidem tantum secundum ea quæ scripta sunt desiderantem; et merito plane ad illa ipsa unigeniti Dei eloquia festinans, ut imperatoriæ sollicitudinis capax pectus etiam divinorum dictorum conscientia plenum sit. Ille qui repudiat, antichristus est; et qui simulat, anathema est Fidem, Imperator, quæris: audi eam non de novis chartulis, sed de Dei libris. . . . Memento tamen neminem hæreticorum esse qui se nunc non secundum Scripturas prædicare ea quibus blasphemati mentiatur Audi, rogo, ea quæ de Christo sunt scripta: ne sub eis ea quæ non scripta sunt prædicentur. Submitte ad ea quæ de libris locuturus sum aures tuas; fidem tuam ad Deum erigas. Audi quod proficit ad fidem, ad unitatem, ad æternitatem. Id. Ad Constant. Aug. lib. ii. §§ 8—10. col. 1229, 30.

² Quæ libro legis non continentur, ea nec nosse debemus. Id. In Ps. 132. § 6. col. 463.

Again; "It is quite right that you should be contented with those things that are written."¹

And as it respects its full revelation of the doctrine of the consubstantiality, and that that doctrine was to be derived thence, he says,—“I never heard the Nicene Creed until I was about to be sent into exile; but *the Gospels and Apostles* told me the meaning of ‘consubstantial,’ and ‘of a similar substance.’”²

ΕΠΙΦΑΝΙΟΥ. (fl. a. 368.)

I proceed to the testimony of Epiphanius.

“We,” he says, “believe that which the truth clearly declares, and sound reason persuades, and is agreeable to *the canon of true religion*, the law, and the prophets, and the patriarchs, who succeeded each other from the beginning, and the teaching of our Saviour himself, and his Apostles, who clearly teach us to confess one God the Father,” &c.³

Again; reproving the errors of the Noetian heretics, he says, “That is agreeable to sound reason, not what these men imagine, but what the truth declares to us through the Divine Scripture.”⁴

Again; “For an answer to every inquiry we cannot speak from our own reasonings, but from consequences drawn from the Scriptures.”⁵

¹ Bene habet, ut iis quæ sunt scripta contentus sis. Id. De Trin. lib. iii. § 23. col. 822.

² Fidem Nicænam nunquam nisi exsulaturus audivi; sed mihi homousii et homœusii intelligentiam Evangelia et Apostoli intimaverunt. Id. De Synod. § 91. col. 1205.

³ Ἡμεῖς γὰρ πιστευομεν, ὡς παντὴ ἡ ἀληθεια ὑποφαινει, καὶ ὁ εὐλογος λογισμος ὁποτιθεται, καὶ τῷ τῆς εὐσεβειας κανονι συμπεφωνηται, τῷ τε Νομῷ καὶ τοῖς Προφηταῖς, καὶ τοῖς ἀπο τῶν ἀνεκαθεν Πατριάρχαις κατ’ ἀκολουθίαν, τῇ τε αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος διδασχῇ, καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ Ἀποστόλων σαφῶς ἡμᾶς διδασκόντων, ἓνα ὁμολογεῖν Θεὸν πατέρα, κ. τ. λ. ΕΠΙΦΑΝ. De Hæres. hæ. 34. Marcos. § 21. vol. i. p. 257. Ed. Paris. 1622.

⁴ Ἐστὶ γὰρ τὸ εὐλογον, οὐχ ὡς οὔτοι δοξαζουσιν, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἡ ἀληθεια διὰ τῆς θειας γραφῆς ἡμῖν ὑποδεικνυσιν. Id. ib. hæ. 57. Noetian. § 3. vol. i. p. 482.

⁵ Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἕκαστην ζητηματος εὔρεσιν οὐκ ἀπο ἰδίων λογισμῶν δυναμεθα λεγεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀπο τῆς τῶν γραφῶν ἀκολουθίας. Id. ib. hæ. 65. Paul. Samos. § 5. i. 611.

Again; speaking of his work called "Ancoratus," he says,—“ But I have already discussed all those points in a large work concerning the faith to which I have given the name ‘Ancoratus.’ For, as far as my poor mind was able by God’s help, *having collected together from the whole Scripture the true doctrines of the divine revelation*, I have clearly set forth as an anchor as it were, for those who please to make use of it, the holy faith of the Fathers, the faith both of the Apostles and Prophets, and that which has been preached in the holy Church of God from the beginning to the present time, to fortify the mind, and preserve it from danger,” &c.¹ When writing respecting the faith, then, he knew no other source from which to obtain it but Scripture, and the faith so derived he calls the faith of the Fathers, meaning by the word Fathers, as the context shows, the Apostles and Prophets; in which sense he has also used the word elsewhere, as we shall show in a future page.²

Again; “ But we who are of the catholic Church, *having taken our confession of faith from the divine Scriptures*, have it thus, that the Father,” &c.³

Again; when about to reply to the errors of the Anomæans, he says,—“ But now having arranged in order the fundamental points of your chapters, I shall bring against each phrase and chapter refutatory arguments from the divine Scriptures, and from right reason, and confutations of your logical questionings.”⁴ How is it,

¹ ΑΛΛ’ ἤδη μοι πεπραγματοῦνται περὶ τούτων πάντων ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ περὶ πίστεως λόγῳ . . . ὃ λόγῳ ἐπεθεμεθα ὀνομα Αἰγκυρωτον. Καὶ γὰρ καθάπερ ὁ ἡμετερος ἐξίσχυσε πτωχὸς νοῦς διὰ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ βοηθείας, ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς συναγοντες τὰ ἀληθινὰ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ διδασκαλίας, ἀγκυραν ὥσπερ τοῖς βουλομένοις τὴν ἁγίαν πατέρων πίστιν, Ἀποστολικὴν τε καὶ Προφητικὴν, καὶ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἀχρι τοῦ δευρο ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ κεκηρυγμένην, σαφῶς παρεθεμεθα, εἰς τὸ κατεχεσθαι τὴν διανοίαν, καὶ ἀσφαλιζεσθαι, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. hæ. 69. Arian. § 27. i. 751, 2.

² See under Cyril of Alex. in § 5 of this chapter.

³ Ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς πίστεως παρεῖληφότες, οὕτως ἐχομεν, ὅτι ὁ Πατὴρ ὁμοίου ἐστὶν ἑαυτοῦ Υἱοῦ πατρὸς, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. hæ. 73. Semiarian. § 14. i. 860.

⁴ Ἀρχὴν δὲ αὐτῆς τῶν ὑπο σοῦ κεφαλαιῶν καθεξῆς κατατάξας, ἀντικρυς ἐκαστὴς λέξεως καὶ κεφαλαίου ἀντιπαραθεσόμεναι τὰς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν καὶ ἐξ ὀρθοῦ λο-

then, that we hear nothing here of the interpretation possessed by the Church, and derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles? Had Epiphanius held the views we are commenting upon, he must necessarily have adverted here to that interpretation, as his authority for the sense he gave to Scripture; but as it is, we hear of nothing but Scripture and right reason. And so, a little further on, he accuses Aetius, the leader of these heretics, because that, being a man by nature, and seeking to understand things beyond nature, (viz. questions relating to the nature of God,) he sought to know them *not by Scripture consequence*, but by the syllogisms of human reasonings;¹ whence, I suppose, it follows, that Epiphanius thought that such questions should be determined by Scripture consequence only, and that too by each individual.

Again; he says to the same heretics,—“ But we must yield our assent with a pious mind and sincere confidence to that which the Holy Spirit teaches us through the holy Scriptures.”² And he concludes, “ I conceive that I have now, according to my ability, sufficiently met his arguments, in a simple style indeed, but with *proofs from the divine Scriptures and pious reasoning*.”³ But all this while we hear nothing of the Church being in possession of an Apostolical traditionary interpretation of Scripture, though this would have cut the matter short at once.

And as to the completeness of the record of the faith contained in Scripture, we may observe the following passage. Writing against the Valentinians, he says,—

γισμον αντιρρησεις τε, και ζητηματων παρα σοι λογικων ανατροπας. Id. ib. hæc. 76. Anom. § 3. i. 933.

¹ Ανθρωπος ων τη φυσει, και τα ὑπερ φυσιν βουλομενος ειδεναι ειδεναι δε ου κατ' ακολουθιαν γραφης αλλ' εκ συλλογισμων βροτειων διανοηματων, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. hæc. 76. Anom. i. p. 949.

² Εξ ευσεβους δε λογισμου, και δικαιας ασφαλειας επι την του ἁγίου Πνευματος δια των ἁγιων γραφων διδασκυλιαν ανακαμπτεον. Id. ib. hæc. 76. Anom. i. 985.

³ Νομιζω δε και ικανως ἡμας προς τας αυτου προτασεις κατα το δυνατον ιδιωτικω λογω, συστασει δε των απο των θειων γραφων, και αυτου του ευσεβους λογισμου προς αυτον απηγγηκεναι. Id. ib. p. 989.

“Their idle fables are destitute of confirmation, *the Scripture nowhere mentioning them*, neither the Law of Moses, nor any prophet of those who came after Moses, nor, moreover, the Saviour, nor his Evangelists, nor the Apostles. For if these things were true, the Lord who came to lighten the world, and the Prophets before him, and then also the Apostles, who reprov'd idolatry, and every act of impiety, and feared not to write against every evil doctrine and opposition to the truth, would have *declared* such things to us *plainly*.”¹

And as to the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, he says, even as to the *word* consubstantial, “But if the word were not in the Divine Scriptures, *though it is, and plainly occurs in the Law, and in the Apostles and Prophets*; for, ‘by two or three witnesses, shall every word be established;’ yet, nevertheless, it would be lawful for us to use, for the interests of true religion, a convenient word,” &c.² And again, still more clearly,—“The word substance does not occur in the letter in the Old and New Testament, BUT THE SENSE IS TO BE FOUND EVERYWHERE.”³

But it will be said, Does not Epiphanius himself, in other places, tell us that there is need of “tradition?” He does so; and we will now consider those passages, and show that they touch not the question of the Rule of faith. The sentiments of the Fathers respecting the Rule of practice, will be considered presently.

¹ Ασυστάτα τα παρ’ αυτοις μυθοποιηματα, ουτε που γραφης ειπουσης, ουτε του Μωυσεως νομου, ουτε τινος Προφητου των μετα Μωυσεα, αλλ’ ουτε του Σωτηρος ουτε των αυτου Ευαγγελιστων, αλλ’ ουτε μιν των Αποστολων. Ει γαρ ταυτα αληθινα υπηρχεν, ο ελθων φωτισαι την οικουμενην Κυριος. και προ αυτου οι Προφηται, επειτα δε και οι Αποστολοι οι ελεγκαντες την ειδωλολατρειαν, πασαν τε παρανομον πραξιν, και μη δειλιασαντες γραφειν κατα πασης παρανομον διδασκαλιας και εναντιοτητος, σαφως αν τα τοιαυτα ημιν κατηγγελλον. Id. ib. hæ. 31. Valent. § 34. i. 205.

² Ει δε μη ην ή λεξις εν ταις θειαις γραφαις, εστι δε και σαφως εγκειται εν νομω και παρ Αποστολοις και τοις Προφηταις· εκ γαρ δυο μαρτυρων η τριων σταθισεται παν ρημα· ομως εξον ην ημιν δι’ ευσεβειαν χρησησθαι λεξει χρησιμη, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. hæ. 69. Arian. § 70. i. 797.

³ Το της ουσιας ονομα, γυμνωσ μεν εν παλαια και καινη ου κειται γραφη, ο νους δε πανταχου φερεται. Id. ib. hæ. 73. Semiarian. § 12. i. 859.

The first is as follows;—"But it is necessary to use tradition also. For all things cannot be gathered from the divine Scripture. Wherefore, the holy Apostles delivered some things by writing, and some by tradition."¹

But what is it, of which Epiphanius is here speaking? The context will show us, for it immediately follows;—"Therefore the holy Apostles of God delivered the precept to the holy Church of God, that it was sinful for any one, after having vowed virginity, to betake himself to marriage."² He is not speaking of any doctrine of the Christian faith, but has in view only directions relating to ecclesiastical duties, and the rites and ordinances of the Christian Church. In his Exposition of the Catholic faith, at the latter end of the work from which we have been quoting, he draws a clear line of distinction between the two. Having laid down the principal doctrines of the Christian faith, he says,—“And these are what the undivided Catholic Church herself holds respecting the faith . . . both with respect to the consubstantiality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and concerning the true appearance of Christ in human nature, and the other parts of the faith. But with respect to her laws, it is now necessary for me briefly to bring forward, in a measure, the form of her laws; such as have been more especially observed in her; and are observed, some by command, and others by a voluntary reception. . . . And in the first place the base, and, so to speak, the foundation in her is virginity.”³ And he proceeds to notice various

¹ Δει δε και παραδοσει κεχρησθαι ου γαρ παντα απο της θειας γραφης δυναται λαμβανεσθαι. Διο τα μεν εν γραφαις, τα δε εν παραδοσει παρεδωκαν οι αγιοι Αποστολοι. *Id. ib. hæc. Apostol. 61. § 6. i. 511.*

² Παρεδωκαν τοινυν οι αγιοι Θεου Αποστολοι τη αγια Θεου Εκκλησια, εφαμαρτον ειμαι το, μετα το δρಿಸαι παρθενιαν, εις γαμον τρεπεσθαι. *Id. ib.*

³ Και α μεν περι πιστεως εχει αυτη η μονη Καθολικη Εκκλησια . . . περι τε Πατρος και Υιου και αγιου Πνευματος ομοουσιωτητος, και περι της ενσαρκου Χριστου και τελειας παρουσιαις, και αλλων μερων της πιστεως· περι θεσμων δε της αυτης εν ολιγω μεν μοι εστι παλιν αναγκη του παραθεσθαι των αυτων θεσμων απο μερους το ειδος, οσαπερ φυσει πεφυλακται εν αυτη, και φυλασσεται, τι μεν εκ προσταγματος, τι δε κατα αποδοχην προαιρεσεως Και πρωτον μεν κρηπις, και, ως ειπειν, βαθμος εν αυτη η παρθενια. *Id. ib. Expos. fid. Cathol. § 21. i. 1103.*

other customs, rites, and ordinances in use in the Church. And then concludes with the remark, already quoted in a former page,¹ namely, that, “as it respects the other mysteries, namely, concerning baptism, and the more sacred mysteries, they are observed, according as *the tradition of the Gospel and the Apostles* [i. e. the New Testament Scripture] *directs.*”

There is but one other passage, as far as I am aware, which appears opposed to our view; and that, *when taken with the context*, offers no real difficulty. Standing alone it reads thus,—“For limits are prescribed to us, and foundations laid, both the structure of the faith, and the traditions of the Apostles, and the holy Scriptures, and the instructions delivered from one to another; and through all these, the truth of God is preserved safe, and let no one be deceived by new fables.”² But take the passage with what precedes, and there is no difficulty; for Epiphanius is not there discussing any point of the faith, but merely some historical matters, namely, the genealogy of some persons mentioned in Scripture. His words are these,—“How many others are there whose genealogies are not clearly given; for instance, Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, Elijah the Tishbite; even their fathers and mothers are nowhere mentioned in all the books of Scripture; but that no error may hence arise, I shall not hesitate to mention what we have received by tradition . . . [and then having given the name of Daniel’s father, and the genealogy of Elijah, he proceeds]. But certainly, with respect to the three children, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, we find nothing either in Apocryphal books, or in traditions. What shall we say, therefore? Shall these persons, I mean Shadrach’s followers, delude us into imagining what it behoves us not; and into holding in high regard and excessive admiration the reports of every conjecture?

¹ See p. 259 above.

² Ὅροι γὰρ ἐτεθῆσαν ἡμῖν, καὶ θεμελίοι, καὶ οἰκοδομὴ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ Ἀποστολῶν παραδόσεις, καὶ γραφαὶ ἁγίαι, καὶ διαδοχαὶ διδασκαλίας, καὶ ἐκ πανταχοθεν ἡ ἀληθεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡσφαλισταὶ καὶ μὴδεὶς ἀπατασθῶ καινοῖς μύθοις. Id. ib. hæc. Melchis. 55. § 3. i. 471.

God forbid. For limits are prescribed to us, and foundations laid, both the structure of the faith and the traditions of the Apostles, and the holy Scriptures, and the instructions delivered from one to another; and through all these, the truth of God is preserved safe; and let no one be deceived by new fables.”¹

When we take this passage with its context, then, it opposes not the doctrine we are endeavouring to establish; for it is written with reference to points which form no part of the Christian faith. The mind of Epiphanius upon our present subject, must be judged by other passages; for no conclusion respecting it can be drawn from this; and in other passages, as we have seen, he supports the view we are defending.

The other references to tradition, to be found in his works, so evidently respect only points either of history or discipline, that it is unnecessary here to consider them.

OPTATUS (fl. a. 368).

The next author that demands our attention, is Optatus; whose clear reference to Scripture, as the Rule of faith, and Judge of controversies, has often been quoted on this subject.

Addressing the Donatists, he says,—“Ye say, It is lawful: we say, It is not lawful. Between your declaration of its lawfulness, and ours of its unlawfulness, the minds of the people are in suspense and agitation. Let neither of us be trusted in the matter. We are all party men. We must inquire for judges. If they are Christians, neither of us can supply them; because truth is impeded by party spirit. We must seek a judge from with-

¹ Ποσοι δε αλλοι ου γενεαλογουνται κατα το φανερωτατον; Δανιηλ, Ξεδραχ, Μισακ, Αβδεναγω, Ηλιας ὁ Θεσβιτης· και εν πασαις ρηταις βιβλοις ουδαμου εμφορονται τουντων οί πατερες τε και μητερες· ἵνα δε μη κατα τουτο πλανεη τις γενηται, ουδεν λυπησει ἂ και ε· παραδοσεις κατειληφμεν λεγειν . . . φυσει δε των τριων παιδων, Ξεδραχ, Μισακ, Αβδεναγω, ουτε εν αποκρυφοις ουτε εν παραδοσεσιν εἰρομεν· τι ουν ερουμεν; αρα κακεινοι, οί περι Ξεδραχ λεγω, φαντασιασουσιν ἡμυς λογιζεσθαι ἂ μη χρη, και ὑπερογκως θαυμιζειν ὑπερ το μετρον τα εκαστης ὑποθεσεως; αλλα μη γενοιτο· και ὁροι γαρ ετεθησαν ἡμιν, κ. τ. λ (ut supra). ID. ib. pp. 470, 1.

out. If he is a Pagan, he cannot know the Christian mysteries; if a Jew, he is the enemy of Christian baptism. Therefore, no verdict can be had on this matter on earth; we must seek a heavenly judge. But why do we apply to heaven, when we have the Will here in the Gospel? For, in this matter, earthly things may properly be compared with heavenly. Like as when any man, having many sons, as long as he, the father, is present himself, he himself gives his commands to each of them; and there is as yet no need of a Will; so Christ, also, as long as he was present upon earth, (although, indeed, he is not now absent,) gave commands to his Apostles for everything that was necessary, as occasion required. But, as an earthly father, when he perceives himself to be near death, fearing lest, after his death, the brothers should quarrel with one another, and go to law, calls witnesses and transfers his wishes from his dying breast to tablets that will endure; and if a contention shall have arisen between the brothers, the grave is not applied to, but the Will is sought; and he who rests in the grave, speaks in silence from the tablets; [so it is with us]. He, whose Will we have, is alive in heaven; therefore, let his desires be sought in the Gospel as his Will.”¹

¹ “ Vos dicitis, licet : nos dicimus, non licet : inter licet vestrum et non licet nostrum, nutant et remigant animæ populorum. Nemo vobis credat, nemo nobis : omnes contentiosi homines sumus. Quærendi sunt iudices : si Christiani, de utraque parte dari non possunt ; quia studiis veritas impeditur. De foris quærendus est iudex : si paganus, non potest Christiana nosse secreta : si Judæus, inimicus est Christiani baptismatis : ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri iudicium ; de cælo quærendus est iudex. Sed ut quid pulsamus ad cælum, cum habeamus hic in Evangelio testamentum ? Quia hoc loco recte possunt terrena cœlestibus comparari : tale est quod quivis hominum habens numerosos filios, quamdiu pater præsens est, ipse imperat singulis ; non est adhuc necessarium testamentum : sic et Christus, quamdiu præsens in terris fuit (quamvis nec modo desit) pro tempore quidquid necessarium erat Apostolis imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus pater, dum se in confinio senserit mortis, timens ne post mortem suam, rupta pace, litigent fratres, adhibitis testibus, voluntatem suam de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diu duraturas : et si fuerit inter fratres nata contentio, non itur ad tumultum, sed quæritur testamentum : et qui in tumultu quiescit, tacitus de tabulis loquitur. Vivus, cujus est testamentum, in cælo est : ergo voluntas ejus, velut in testamento sic in Evangelio requiratur.” OPTATI De Schism. Donat. adv. Parmen. lib. v. § 3. Ed. Par. 1700. p. 81.

How completely contrary this language to that of the Romanists and the Tractators! Here Optatus, a Catholic, fully admits that the judgment of the Catholics upon a question, had *intrinsically* no more weight than that of the Donatists; and that Scripture only could give a decisive and authoritative verdict.

BASIL OF CÆSAREA (fl. a. 370.)

We now come to Basil of Cæsarea, whose witness is as follows.

“It is,” saith he, “a manifest defection from the faith, and mark of pride, either to reject anything of what is written, or *to introduce anything of what is not written*; our Lord Jesus Christ saying, my sheep hear my voice, . . . and the Apostle, by an example taken from human things, very earnestly forbidding us to *add to*, or take away from *anything in the inspired Scriptures*, when he says, ‘A man’s will, when confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth to.’ [Gal. iii. 15].”¹

No words, surely, can more strongly declare the *exclusive* claims of Scripture, as the Rule of faith and record of revelation, than these.

And in the context, also, the same doctrine is clearly enforced.

“Ye also, yourselves,” he says, “well know that it is the duty of the faithful servant, whatsoever he may have been entrusted with by the good master to administer to his fellow-servants, to preserve these things for them safe, and neither corrupt nor purloin them. Thus I also am bound to place before you, agreeably to the will of God, for the common benefit, *whatsoever I have learned from the inspired Scripture*.” “While, therefore, I had

¹ Φανερά εκπτώσις πίστεως και υπερηφανίας κατηγορία, η αθετεί τι των γεγραμμενων, η επεισαγειν των μη γεγραμμενων, του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου ειποντος, τα εμα προβατα της εμης φωνης ακουει και του αποστολου εν υποδειγματι ανθρωπινω σφοδροτερον απαγορευοντος το προσθειναι η υφελειν τι ενταις θεοπνευστοις γραφαις, δι’ ων φησιν’ όμως ανθρωπον κεκυρωμενην διαθηκην ουδεις αθετεί η επιδιατασσεται. BASIL. CÆSAR. Serm. de fide, § i. tom. ii. p. 224. ed. Bened.

to contend against the heresies that have arisen at various times, following those who have preceded me, I considered it convenient, out of regard to the impieties vented by the devil, to stop the spread of them, by words directly opposed to the error, and also to overturn the blasphemies introduced; and to use different words at different times, as the necessities of those who were labouring under error required; and those oftentimes not words of Scripture; but, nevertheless, not alien to the orthodox meaning of Scripture: the Apostle often not disdaining to use heathen words suitable to his subject. [Where, as Archbishop Laud remarks, “he makes the Scripture the *Touchstone* or *trial*” of those unwritten words.]¹ But now I have considered it suitable, both to your and my object, in the simplicity of a sound faith, in fulfilling the command of your love in Christ, to speak what I have been taught by the inspired Scripture, sparingly using even those names and words which are not found in the very letters in the Divine Scripture, though they preserve the meaning of Scripture.”² And soon after follows the passage already quoted.

And in the latter part of the same treatise, he proceeds to say,—“We have neither power nor leisure to collect together, on the present occasion, all the things that are

¹ Against Fisher § 16. n. 26. p. 59. ed. 1686.

² Διακονου δε πιστου ιδιον ιστε παντως και αυτοι, το, ἄπερ αν εις τους συνδουλους οικονομησαι παρα του αγαθου δεσποτου πιστευθη, ταυτα διασωσαι τουτοις ανοθεν-τως και ακαπηλευτως· ὥστε καγω, ἄπερ εμαθον εκ της θεοπνευστου γραφης, ταυτα ὑμιν παραθεσθαι κατα το αρεσκον Θεω, προς το κοινη συμφερον οφειλετης ειμι. . . . Ἔως μεν ουν αγωνιζεσθαι προς τας επανισταμενας κατα καιρον αἵρεσεις εχρην, ἐπομενος τοις προειληφοσιν, ακολουθον ἡγουμην τη διαφορα της επισπειρομενης ὑπο του διαβολου ασεβειας, ταις αντιθετοις φωναις κωλυνειν, η και ανατρεπειν τας επαγομενας βλασφημιας, και αλλοτε αλλαις, ὡς αν ἡ χρεια των νοσούντων κατη-αγκασε, και ταυταις πολλακις αγραφοις μεν, ὅμως δε ουν ουκ απεξενωμεναις της κατα την γραφην ευσεβους διανοιας· του αποστολου πολλακις τοις Ἑλληνικοις ῥημασι χρησασθαι μη παραιτησαμενου προς τον ιδιον σκοπον. Νυν δε προς τον κοινον ἡμων τε και ὑμων σκοπον ἄρμοζον ελογισαμην, εν ἀπλοτητι της ὑγιαίνουσας πιστεως, το επιταγμα της ὑμετερας εν Χριστῳ αγαπης πληρωσαι, ειπων ἡ ἐδι-δαχθην παρα της θεοπνευστου γραφης· φειδομενος μεν και των ονοματων και ῥηματων εκεινων, ἃ λεξεσι μεν αυταις ουκ εμφερεται τη θεια γραφη, διανοιαν γε μὴν την εκεινην εγκειμενην τη γραφη διασωζει. Id. ib. § 1. ii. 223, 224.

everywhere spoken by the inspired Scripture concerning the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit. But having placed before you a few out of all these, we think these sufficient for your conviction, and for a demonstration that our views are *from the Scriptures*; and for the satisfaction, both of yourselves, and those who desire it of us.”¹ And he then proceeds to give the articles of *the creed*, with Scripture proofs, showing that even these he derived from Scripture; and goes on to say,—“Wherefore I exhort and beseech you to refrain from useless inquiries, and unseemly contentions about words, and be *satisfied with what is said by the sacred writers and the Lord himself*, and to be of a mind worthy your heavenly calling, and to conduct yourselves worthily of the gospel of Christ,” &c.;² adding, a little further on,—“Observing that admonition, ‘Beware of false prophets’ [Matth. vii. 15.], and that, ‘Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of us,’ [2 Thess. iii. 6], *let us walk by the rule* (or, *canon*) *of the sacred writers*, as built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, &c. [Eph. ii. 20].”³

And he concludes by saying that having, in what had preceded, spoken sufficiently for the occasion respecting the orthodox faith, he would then proceed to give the in-

¹ Ἦμιν δε παντα μεν τα πανταχου ὑπο της θεοπνευστου γραφης περι τε Πατρος και Υιου και Ἀγιου Πνευματος ειρημενα, το παρον αναλεγειν ουτε δυναμις ουτε σχολη . . . ολιγα δε εκ παντων παραθεμενοι, αρκειν ἡγουμεθα και ταυτα τη ὑμετερα συνειδησει, προς τε την του ἡμετερου εκ των γραφων φρονηματος φανερωσιν, και των ὡμων αυτων, και των βουλομενων εφ’ ἡμιν πληροφοριαν. Id. ib. § 3. ii. 227.

² Διοπερ παρακαλω και δεομαι, παυσαμενους της περιεργου ζητησεως και απρεπους λογομαχιας, αρκεισθαι τοις ὑπο των ἁγιων και αυτου του Κυριου ειρημενοις, αξια δε της επουρανιου κλησεως φρονειν, και αξιως του ευαγγελιου του Χριστου πολιτευεσθαι, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. § 5. ii. 228. If any proof is required that των ἁγιων here means *the sacred writers*, see Basil. Adv. Eunom. lib. ii. § 2. init. quoted p. 396 below, and (if supposed genuine) De Sp. S. c. 13. iii. 24. D.

³ Τηρουντες κακεινο το, Προσεχετε απο των ψευδοπροφητων και το, Στελλεσθαι ὑμας απο παντος αδελφου ατακτως περιπατοντος, και μη κατα την παραδοσιν ἡν παρελαβον παρ’ ἡμων, στοιχωμεν τω κανονι των ἁγιων, ὡς εποικοδομηθεντες επι τω θεμελιω των αποστολων και προφητων, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. § 5. ii. 229.

structions he had promised respecting *morals*; and that he had drawn up his rules, by collecting together whatever things were spoken of with approbation or reprehension in the *New Testament*.¹

In the Treatise on *Morals* which follows, we have three other forcible testimonies of the same kind.

The subject of one of his "Rules" is given by him thus,—"That it is right that every word or thing should be accredited by the testimony of the inspired Scripture, for the full assurance of the good, and the confusion of the wicked."²

Again, still more decisively;—"It is right that those hearers who have learned the Scriptures, should test what is said by their teachers, and receive those things that are agreeable to the Scriptures, and reject those that are contrary; and earnestly avoid those that persevere in maintaining such doctrines."³

And again; "What is the peculiar characteristic of a Christian? Faith that worketh by love. What is the peculiar characteristic of faith? A firm and unwavering assurance of the truth of the inspired words, not to be shaken by any reasoning; either such as is introduced by physical necessity, or such as comes under the garb of piety. What is the peculiar characteristic of a believer? To rest in such an assurance, through the power of the words spoken, and not to dare to reject anything contained therein, or to add anything to them. For if, as the Apostle says, everything that is not of faith is sin, and faith is by hearing, and hearing by the word of God,

¹ 'Όσα εύρισκομεν κατα την Καινην τews Διαθηκην σποραδην απηγορευμενα η εγκεκριμενα, ταυτα, κατα το δυνατον ημιν, εις όρους κεφαλαιωδεις προς το ευληπτον τοις βουλομενοις εσπουδασαμην συναγαγειν. Id. ib. § 6. ii. 229.

² 'Ότι δει παν βημα η πραγμα πιστουσθαι τη μαρτυρια της θεοπνευστου γραφης εις πληροφοριαν μεν των αγαθων, εντροπην δε των ποιηρων. Id. Moral. Regul. xxvi. c. 1. ii. 256.

³ 'Ότι δει των ακροατων τους πεκαιδευμενους τας γραφας δοκιμαζειν τα παρα των διδασκαλων λεγομενα και τα μεν συμφωνα ταις γραφαις δεχεσθαι, τα δε αλλοτρια αποβαλλειν και τους τοιουτοις διδαγμασιν επιμενοντας αποστρεφεισθαι σφοδροτερον. Id. ib. Reg. lxxii. c. 1. ii. 306.

everything that is not contained in the inspired Scripture, not being of faith, is sin."¹

We hence see how entire was his conviction that *the word of God* was *only* to be found in the Scriptures; and that the Scriptures were the entire and *perfect* rule of faith.

Moreover, in a treatise of the same kind, but thrown into the form of question and answer, we meet with several passages to the same effect.

The first is as follows,—“Whether it is lawful or desirable for any one to allow himself even to do or say what he thinks good, without the testimony of the inspired Scriptures:”² and in his answer he discountenances such conduct. This goes much further than we should have any wish to contend for.

Again;—“Whether it is desirable for new converts immediately to learn things from the Scriptures;” to which the answer is, that it is “proper and necessary that each one should learn that which is useful *from the inspired Scripture*, both for the establishment of his piety, and that he may not be accustomed to *human traditions*.”³

Again;—“What mind ought a prelate to have in those things which he commands or appoints?” To which the reply is,—“Towards God, as a servant of Christ, and a steward of the mysteries of God, fearing lest he should

¹ Τι ιδιον Χριστιανου; πιστις δι' αγαπης ενεργουμενη. Τι ιδιον πιστεως; αδιακριτος πληροφορια της αληθειας των θεοπνευστων βημάτων, ουδενι λογισμω, ουτε υπο φυσικης αναγκης εισαγομενω, ουτε προς ευσεβειαν εσχηματισμενω διασालεωμενη. Τι ιδιον πιστου; το εν τοιαυτη πληροφορια συνδιατιθεσθαι τη δυναμει των ειρηνεων, και μηδεν τολμαν αθετειν η επιδιατασσεσθαι. Ει γαρ παν ο ουκ εκ πιστεως, αμαρτια εστιν, ως φησιν ο αποστολος, η δε πιστις εξ ακοης, η δε ακοη δια βήματος Θεου, παν το εκτος της θεοπνευστου γραφης ουκ εκ πιστεως ον, αμαρτια εστιν. Id. ib. Reg. lxxx. c. 22, ii. 317.

² Ει εξεστιν η συμφερει τινι εαυτω επιτρεπειν, και ποιειν η λεγειν α νομιζει καλα, ανευ της μαρτυριας των θεοπνευστων γραφων. Id. Reg. brev. Interrog. l. ii. 414.

³ Ει συμφερει τοις αρτι προσερχομενοις ευθυς τα απο των γραφων εκμανθανειν; Το προς την χρειαν εκαστον εκμανθανειν εκ της θεοπνευστου γραφης ακολουθον κα: αναγκαιον εις τε πληροφοριαν της θεοσεβειας, και υπερ του μη προσεθισθηναι ανθρωπιναις παραδοσεσιν. Id. ib. Interrog. et resp. xcvi. ii. 449.

either speak or order anything beyond the will of God, *as declared in the Scriptures*, and be found a false witness of God, or sacrilegious, in either introducing anything foreign to the doctrine of the Lord, or omitting anything acceptable to God.”¹

To these testimonies, many others may be added from other parts of his works.

Thus, in his homily on repentance, he says,—“ We shall treat of repentance from the Old and New Testament; for these are the Church’s treasures.”²

And, in a passage cited in a former part of this chapter, he says, speaking of a thing derived from “ the Fathers,” “ But it is not sufficient for us that it is the tradition of the Fathers. For they also followed the mind of Scripture; having taken their first principles from the testimonies which, a short time since, we placed before you, from the Scripture.”³

Again;—“ It is the duty of a pious mind to fear to speak of the Holy Spirit, things that are not mentioned in the Holy Scriptures; and to believe that the knowledge and accurate comprehension of the Holy Spirit, are reserved for us to the future world.”⁴

Moreover, he very expressly refers to Scripture as the Judge of controversies, and that in the highest points of faith.

Thus, in his controversy with Eunomius, he says,—“ What mode of investigation could be more proper, than

¹ Ποταπον φρονημα οφειλει εχειν ο προεστως εν οἷς επιτασσει η διατασσεται. Resp. Pros men ton Theon, ws ὑπηρετης Χριστου και οικονομος μυστηριων Θεου φοβουμενος μη τι παρα το θελημα του Θεου το εν ταις γραφαις ὁμολογουμενον η ειπη η τυπωση, και εὑρεθη ψευδομαρτυς του Θεου, η ἱεροσυλος, εν τω η επεισταγειν τι αλλοτριον της του Κυριου διδασκαλιας, η παραλειψαι τι των αρεσκοντων Θεω. Id. ib. Interrog. et Resp. xcvi. ii. 450.

² Λεξομεν περι μετανοιας εκ παλαιας τε και καινης. ‘Ουτοι γαρ της εκκλησιας θησαυροι. Id. Homil. de Pœnit. § 1. ii. 603.

³ Id. De Spir. S. c. 7. iii. 13. See p. 260 above.

⁴ Ευσεβους γαρ εστι διανοιας τα αποσιωπηθεντα εν ταις ἁγαις γραφαις ευλαβεισθαι επιφημιζειν το ἁγιω Πνευματι, πεπεισθαι δε την εμπειριαν αυτου κα ακριβη καταληψιν εις τον ὑστερον ἡμιν υποκεισθαι αιωνα. Id. Adv. Eunom. lib. iii. § 7. i. 278.

that we should compare what is said with the documents given to us by the Spirit, and receive that which we find to agree with them, and give no credence to that which is opposed to them, but avoid it as an enemy. First, therefore, let him show this, which of the sacred writers have called Christ an offspring and a thing made? What passages of the Scriptures has he to prove this?"¹

And in the Epistle to Eustathius, ascribed to him, occurs a similar and still stronger passage to the same effect;² but as this Epistle is with greater probability attributed to his brother, Gregory of Nyssa, I shall cite it when considering the testimony of the latter.

Further, to the passages already quoted, declarative of the perfection of Scripture as the rule of faith, we may add the following; which occur, however, in Treatises placed by the Benedictines in their Appendix, as in their *opinion* not genuine works of Basil. The reader may judge for himself, as we need not their testimony.

"Believe those things that are written. What is not written inquire not into."³

And elsewhere he tells us that "all the commands of Christ are written."⁴

Now, from these passages, it is very obvious that if Basil has elsewhere advocated the views of the Tractators, he has most pointedly contradicted himself.

Let us see, however, whether he is so chargeable.

The chief passage always adduced from him against our views is from the latter part of the Treatise on the

Τίς ἂν οὖν τρόπος τῆς ἐξετάσεως δίκαιότερος γένοιτο, ἢ τοῖς διδασκασι τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡμῖν δεδομένοις τὸν λόγον συγκρίνοντας, ὃ μὲν ἂν ἐκείνοις συμφωνοῦν εἴρωμεν καταδεχέσθαι, τῷ δὲ ἐναντίως ἔχοντι ἀπιστεῖν καὶ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἀποφευγεῖν; Πρῶτον τοίνυν ἐκεῖνο δεικνύτω, τίνες τῶν ἁγίων γεννημα καὶ ποιημα τὸν Χριστὸν προσειρηκάσι; ποίας ἔχει φωνὰς τῶν γραφῶν εἰς ἀποδείξιν; *Id.* Adv. Eunom. lib. ii. § 2. i. 238, 9.

¹ *Id.* Epist. 189. § 3. iii. 277.

² Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πιστεύε, τι μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζητεῖ. *Id.* Homil. adv. calumn. S. Trin. § 4. ii. 611.

³ Εἰ μὴ πάντα ἡμῖν πρὸς τὸν τῆς σωτηρίας σκοπὸν ἀναγκαιὰ ἦν, οὐτ' ἂν ἐγράψαν πάσαι αἱ ἐντολαί. *Id.* Sermon. de virt. et vit. § 1. iii. 469.

Holy Spirit, and consequently from a portion of the works attributed to him, which has been very generally adjudged by our best divines, and by Erasmus, if not others, among the Romanists, to be spurious. To the judgment of Erasmus and of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Stillingfleet and Robert Cooke, of our own divines, I have already directed the attention of the reader.¹ And to these we may add many others.

Thus Bishop Patrick says of it, that it is “a counterfeit part of a book of St. Basil, into which *somebody hath foisted* a discourse about *Tradition*, which as it belongs not at all to his subject, so it contradicts his sense in another place; particularly in his book of *Confession of Faith*, where he saith, ‘It is a manifest infidelity and arrogance, either to reject what is written, or to add anything that is not written.’ But admit those words which this man quotes to be St. Basil’s, they are manifestly false by the confession of the Roman church *in that sense wherein he takes them*. For if those things which he reckons up as *Apostolical traditions* have equal force with those things which are written in the Scripture, how comes the Church of Rome to lay aside several of them? For instance, the words of invocation at the ostension of the bread of the eucharist and the cup of blessing; the consecration of him that is baptized; standing in prayer on the first day of the week and all the time between Easter and Whitsuntide? And how comes it about that others of them are left at liberty, such as praying towards the East, and the threefold immersion in baptism? Both which they themselves acknowledge to be indifferent; and yet are mentioned by this *false* St. Basil (so I cannot but esteem him that wrote this) among the things which are of equal force unto godliness with those delivered in Scripture. Nay, he proceeds so far as to say in the words following, that if we should reject such unwritten traditions we should give a deadly wound to the gospel, or rather contract it into a bare name. *A saying*

¹ See vol. 1. pp. 207, 8.

*so senseless, or rather impious, that if these men had but a grain of common honesty, they could not thus endeavour to impose upon the world by such spurious stuff, as I would willingly think they have wit enough to see this is."*¹

And so Archbishop Laud, quoting Bishop Andrews as his authority, says,—“The learned take exceptions to this book of St. Basil as corrupted. Bp. Andr. Opusc. contr. Peron. p. 9.”²

The passage relates to the wording of the Doxology, and the writer defends the use of the words “*with the Holy Spirit*,” on the ground of patristical tradition being in their favour, observing, that, “Of the doctrines and instructions preserved in the Church, some we have from the teaching of Scripture, and others we have received delivered down to us secretly from the tradition of the Apostles; both of which have the like force towards piety; and no one will contradict these things, no one at least who has any experience of the laws of the Church; for if we should attempt to repudiate the unwritten *customs* as not having any great weight, we should unwittingly injure the gospel in the very principal points, or rather reduce the gospel to a mere name.”³ And he then instances the sign of the cross in baptism, and other points of a like kind. A similar passage occurs shortly after.⁴

That the author of these passages should be the same as the one who wrote what we have quoted above, it is hardly possible to conceive. Indeed, they are directly opposed to a passage (already quoted) occurring in *the*

¹ Patrick's Answer to Touchstone of Reformed Gospel, pp. 33—5.

² Answer to Fisher, § 16. n. 26. p. 59. ed. 1686.

³ Των εν τη εκκλησια κεφυλαγμενων δογματων και κηρυγματων, τα μεν εκ της εγγραφου διδασκαλιας εχομεν, τα δε εκ της των αποστολων παραδοσεως διαδοθεντα ημιν εν μυστηριω παρεδεξαμεθα· απερ αμφοτερα την αυτην ισχυν εχει προς την ευσεβειαν· και τουτοις ουδεις αντερει, ουκ ουν ος τις γε κατα μικρον γουν θεσμων εκκλησιαστικων πεπειραται. Ει γαρ επιχειρησαιμεν τα αγραφα των εθων ως μη μεγαλην εχοντα την δυναμιν παραιτεισθαι, λαθοιμεν αν εις αυτα τα κα·ρια ζημιουντες το ευαγγελιον· μαλλον δε εις ονομα ψιλον περιι̃στωντες το κηρυγμα. De Spir. S. c. 27. BASIL. Op. iii. 54.

⁴ Αποστολικον οιμαι και το ταις αγραφοις παραδοσεσι παραμενειν. Ib. c. 29. iii. 60.

former part of the same treatise, where, speaking of a similar phrase with relation to the Son, Basil says that though it was from the Fathers it was *not enough that it was the tradition of the Fathers, but that they had derived it from the Scriptures.*¹

That this work has been, to say the least, interpolated and corrupted, must, I think, be clear to every impartial reader.

Moreover, this author, whoever he is, when he descends to particulars, seems only to apply his observations to customs and matters of form and discipline, not to points of faith, as if tradition was any part of the rule of faith. And in such matters it might perhaps be said, that there are some unwritten customs that have the same force towards piety as some customs commanded in Scripture. The force of the passage, according to Bishop Stillingfleet, is this;—"It was objected that the form S. Basil used was not found in Scripture; he answers, that the equivalent is there found, and that there were some things received by tradition which had the same force towards piety. And if we take away all unwritten customs we shall do wrong to the gospel, and leave a bare name to the public preaching. And from thence he insists on some traditionary rites, as the sign of the cross, praying towards the East, &c. His business is to show that to the greater solemnity of Christian worship several customs were observed in the Church, which are not to be found in Scripture. And if other antient customs were received which are not commanded in Scripture, he sees no reason that they should find such fault with this."²

The passage, therefore, seems at any rate intended only to apply to matters of form and ecclesiastical rites.

And what is more, the view which the author of it takes is essentially different to that of the Romanists and the

¹ De Sp. S. c. 7. iii. 13. See p. 260 above.

² Stillingfleet's Council of Trent examined p. 25. See also his Grounds of Protestant religion, pp. 242—4, ed. 1665, and Archbishop Laud against Fisher, § 16. n. 26. p. 59. ed. 1686.

Tractators, for he speaks of his "traditions" as secretly and silently conveyed down under the veil of mystery, and not published abroad in the writings of the Fathers.¹

Let us proceed, however, to some passages that are quoted against our view from the genuine works of Basil, and we shall find that not one of them advocates more than what we readily admit, namely, that the works of the Fathers are to be referred to as affording a confirmatory argument for the orthodox faith.

For instance, the first passage merely amounts to a general declaration of regard for the statements of the Fathers, more particularly when compared with those of the heretic Eunomius,—in which we most fully agree. The passage with its context stands thus;—Eunomius having spoken slightly of the Fathers, and of the sentiments of the great body of Christians either then living or of any former age, Basil replies,—“What do you say? are we not to attribute the greater weight to those who have preceded us? Are we not to hold in respect the multitude both of the Christians of the present time and of those who have lived since the gospel was first preached? Are we not to take into account the dignity of those who have been distinguished by spiritual gifts of all kinds, in opposition and hostility to all of whom you have now introduced this wicked path of impiety? But having altogether closed the eyes of our mind and driven out of our memory the recollection of every holy man, are we each of us to come and subject his mind in a passive state, cleared of all former impressions, to your vagaries and sophisms? You would be possessed of great power indeed, if it shall fall to your lot to have the command of those things which the devil himself with his various artifices has not

¹ Απο της σιωπῶμενης καὶ μυστικῆς παραδόσεως ἐκ τῆς ἀδημοσιευτοῦ ταύτης καὶ ἀπορρητοῦ διδασκαλίας, ἥν ἐν ἀπολυπραγμονητῷ καὶ ἀπεριεργαστῷ σιγῇ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐφυλάξαν, καλῶς ἐκεῖνο δεδιδασκεμένοι, τῶν μυστηρίων το σέμνον σιωπῇ διασωζέσθαι; ἃ γὰρ οὐδε ἐποπτεῖν ἐξεστὶ τοῖς ἀμύητοις, τούτων πῶς ἀν ἡν εἰκος τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐκθριαμβεῖν ἐν γραμμασιν; De Sp. S. c. 27. iii. 55.

obtained ; if, that is, in obedience to you we should judge the tradition that has been held by *so many* holy men [he was too wise a man to talk of *every body always everywhere*] in all past time less valuable than your impious conceits." ¹ In all this I need not say that there is not one word from which we dissent.

Again, Basil says in his Homily against the Sabellians and others,—“ But let the tradition deter you from separating the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son. The Lord hath thus taught, Apostles have proclaimed this doctrine, Fathers have kept it, martyrs have confirmed it. Be satisfied to speak as you have been taught.” ² But this passage confirms our view ; for by consulting the preceding context we find that “ the tradition ” referred to is “ the tradition of baptism,” ³ that is, our Lord’s tradition delivered Matt. xxviii. 19 ; and, in fact, the grounds upon which the matter is placed are precisely those for which we contend, namely, the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles as the foundation, and that of Fathers and martyrs as in their place confirmatory of the correctness of our view of a doctrine. And, therefore, we agree fully with the admonition of Basil in the context,—“ I entreat you, not to seek in every way to hear from me that

¹ Τι λεγεις ; μη νειμωμεν το πλεον τοις προλαβουσι ; μη αιδεσθωμεν το πληθος των τε νυν οντων Χριστιανων, και των ὅσοι γεγωνασιν ἀφ’ οὗ κατηγγελη το εὐαγγελιον ; μη λογισωμεθα το αξιωματων εν παντοιοις χαρισμασι διαφανεντων πνευματικοις, οἷς ἅσασιν εχθραν και πολεμιαν την πονηραν ὁδον ταυτην της ασεβειας εκαινοτομησας ; αλλα μυσαντες ἀπαξ απλως τους της ψυχης οφθαλμους, και παντος ἁγιου μνημην της διανοιας ὑπερορισαντες, σχολαζουσιν και σεσαρωμενην την ἑαυτου καρδιαν ἑκαστος ταις παραγωγαις σου και τοις σοφισμασι φεροντες ὑποθωμεν ; μεγαλης μεν τ’ αν ειης της δυναστειας επειλημμενος, ειπερ ὦν ταις ποικιλαις ἑαυτου μεθοδειαῖς ὁ διαβολος ουκ επετυχε, τουτων σοι τυχειν εξ επιταγματος περιεσται· εαν περ πεισθεντες σοι, την εν παντιω παρελθοντι χρονω ὑπο τοσούτων ἁγιων κεκρατηκυιαν παραδοσιν ατιμοτεραν κρινωμεν της δυσσεβους ὑμων επινοιας. Adv. Eunom. lib. i. § 3. i. 210, 11.

² Αλλα μη χωρισης Πατρος και Υιου το Πνευμα το ἅγιον, δυσωπειτω σε ἡ παραδοσις. Ὁ Κυριος οὕτως ἐδίδαξεν, αποστολοι εκηρυξαν, πατερες διετηρησαν, μαρτυρες εβεβαιωσαν· αρκεσθητι λεγειν ὡς ἐδίδαχθης. Hom. contra Sabell. Arium et Anom. § 6. ii. 194.

³ Ἡ παραδοσις του βαπτισματος. Ib. The passage is very similar to one of Athanasius quoted above, vol. i. pp. 121, 2.

which is agreeable to you, but that which is well-pleasing to the Lord, and accordant with the Scriptures, and not at variance with the Fathers.”¹

Thus, also, he says elsewhere, after having laid down what he considered to be the orthodox faith,—“These, brethren, are the mysteries of the Church, these are the traditions of the Fathers,”² where he states what he justly considered as a stringent argument for the reception of what he had been delivering, but not as any part of the rule of faith, for he immediately adds, “We adjure every man who fears the Lord and expects the judgment of God, not to be carried away by divers doctrines. If any one teaches otherwise and adheres not to the whole-some words of the faith, but, rejecting *the oracles of the Spirit*, holds his own teaching to be of more authority than *the Evangelical documents*, avoid such a man;”³ where we plainly see what was his sole rule of faith.

Again; he says,—“But as to the faith, we neither receive that which is written by others, junior to us, nor dare ourselves to deliver the offspring of our own conceits, that we may not make the words of the orthodox faith dependent upon men; but what we have been taught by the holy Fathers, that we deliver to those who question us.”⁴ But “the holy Fathers” here mentioned are only “the Nicene Fathers,” for it follows,—“Therefore the

¹ Ὅτις δὲ παρικαλῶ μὲν, μὴ ἐκ παντός τῳ τρόπῳ ζητεῖν τὸ ὑμῖν ἀρεσκόν παρ’ ἡμῶν ἀκουσάιν, ἀλλ’ ὃ τῷ Κυρίῳ εὐαρεστον ἐστίν, καὶ συμφώνον ταῖς γραφαῖς, καὶ μὴ μάχόμενον τοῖς πατράσιν. Ib. § 4. ii. 193.

² Ταῦτα ἐστίν, ἀδελφοί, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυστήρια, αὐταὶ τῶν πατέρων αἱ παραδόσεις. Ep. ad Sozopolit. ep. 261. § 3. iii. 403.

³ Διαμαρτυρομεθα παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ φοβούμενῳ τὸν Κύριον, καὶ κρίσιν Θεοῦ ἀναμενοντι, διδιχαῖς ποικίλαις μὴ παραφερέσθαι. Εἰ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγμῖνοισι λόγοις τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ παρωθόμενος τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος λογία τὴν οἰκίαν διδασκαλίαν κυριωτέραν ποιεῖται τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν διδαγμάτων, φυλάσσεσθε τὸν τοιοῦτον. Ib.

⁴ Πιστὶν δὲ ἡμεῖς, οὔτε παρ’ ἄλλων γραφομένην ἡμῖν νεωτέραν [? νεωτέρων] παραδεχομεθα, οὔτε αὐτοὶ τὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας διανοίας γεννημένα παραδίδοναι τολμαμεν, ἵνα μὴ ἀνθρώπινα ποιήσωμεν τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας βήματα· ἀλλ’ ἅπερ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων δεδιδάγμεθα, ταῦτα τοῖς ἐρωτήσιν ἡμᾶς διαγγέλλομεν. Epist. ad eccles. Antioch. ep. 140. § 2. iii. 233.

creed written by the holy Fathers, those, I mean, that met at Nicæa, has been received in our Church from the times of our Fathers,"¹ and he then proceeds to deliver the Nicene creed.

And this assembly that met at Nicæa, or Nice, he justly considers to have strong claims upon our regard, though *not to demand our faith*; for having spoken of the creed promulgated by the Fathers that met at Nicæa, and noticed the fact that some persons did not receive the word "consubstantial," which they had introduced into it, he says,—“Whom any one might perhaps justly blame, and yet again might judge them excusable. For, on the one hand, not to follow the Fathers, and esteem their word of more authority than their own notions, is worthy of blame as a very arrogant thing; while again, on the other hand, to be suspicious of a word blamed by others, this seems pretty well to clear them from blame. For in truth those that met in the matter of Paul of Samosata, found fault with the phrase as not sounding appropriate.”²

In all these passages, then, (which, if not all, are at least the strongest that can be brought from the writings of Basil that have any show of supporting the views of our opponents,) we find nothing which, when compared with his clear statements as to the claims of Holy Scripture, given above, presents any difficulty as to his views on the subject.

GREGORY OF NYSSA (fl. a. 370.)

From Basil let us pass to his brother, Gregory of Nyssa.

¹ Εστι τοιουν εκ πατερων εμπολιτευομενη τη εκκλησια ήμων ή γραφεισα πυρα των άγιων πατερων πιστις, των κατα την Νικαιαν συνελθοντων. Ib.

² Ός και μεμφαιτο αν τις δικαιως, και παλιν μεν τοι συγγνωμης αυτοις αξιοσειεν. Το μεν γαρ πατρασι μη ακολουθειν, και την εκεινων φωνην κυριωτεραν τιθεσθαι της έαυτου γωμης, εγκληματος αξιον, ως αυθαδεις γεμον. Το δε παλιν ύφ' έτερων διαβληθεισαν αυτην ύποπτον εχειν, τουτο πως δοκει του εγκληματος αυτοις μετριως ελευθερουν' και γαρ τω οντι, οί επι Παυλω τω Σαμοσατει συνελθοντες, διεβαλον την λεξιν ως ουκ ευσημον. Ep. ad Canonicas. ep. 52 §. 1. iii. 145.

First; Is Scripture solely and exclusively the authoritative rule of faith? The following passages will show us his opinion on this point.

In his treatise, "On the soul and the resurrection," written in the form of a dialogue between himself and his celebrated sister Macrina, he says,—

"We have not this power, the power I mean of saying what we please, inasmuch as we use *the holy Scripture as our rule for every doctrine and our law; and being under the necessity of referring to this, we receive that only whatsoever may be agreeable to the scope of what is there written.*"¹

And a little further on the dialogue runs thus;—"I think it behoves us to inquire, with respect to what has been said, whether that which divine inspiration has taught us is consonant with these things. But, said she, [i. e. Macrina] who could possibly deny, but that we must consider *that alone to be truth for which there is the seal of Scripture testimony?*"²

Again; writing against Eunomius, he says,—“But let us proceed to that which follows of his discourse, after we have added a few words directed to the confirmation of our doctrine. For since the inspired testimony is the *sure criterion of truth* in the case of EVERY doctrine, I think it well to prove the truth of what I have said by citing the divine oracles.”³

¹ Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀμοῖροι ταύτης ἐσμεν. τῆς λέγειν φημι ἅπερ βουλομεθα, κανόνι παντός δογματός καὶ νόμῳ κεχρημένοι τῇ ἁγίᾳ γραφῇ ἀναγκαιῶς πρὸς ταύτην βλέποντες τοῦτο δεχομεθα μόνον ὅτιπερ ἂν ἡ συμφωνοῦν τῶ των γεγραμμένων σκοπῷ. GREGOR. NYSS. De anim. et resurrect. tom. ii. pp. 632, 3. ed. 1615—18. tom. iii. pp. 200, 1. ed. 1638.

² Ζῆτεῖν οἶμαι δεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημενοῖς, εἰ ἡ θεοπνευστος διδασκαλία τοῦτοις συμφερεται. Ἡ δὲ, Καν τις ἂν ἀντεῖποι, φησι, μὴ οὐχὶ ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ τὴν ἀληθειᾶν τιθεσθῶ, ὧ σφραγὶς ἐπεστί τῆς γραφικῆς μαρτυρίας. Ib. tom. ii. p. 639. ed. 1615—18. tom. iii. p. 207. ed. 1638.

³ Ἡμεῖς δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἐφεξῆς τοῦ λόγου προελθώμεν μικρῶν ἐτι πρὸς συστάσιν τοῦ ἡμετέρου δογματος προσδιορθέντων [? προσδιορθωθέντων]· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ κριτήριον ἀσφαλὲς τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπὶ παντός δογματος ἡ θεοπνευστος ἐστὶ μαρτυρία, καλῶς ἔχειν ἡγούμεναι τὴν παραθεσὶ των θείων καὶ τὸν ἡμετέρον λόγον πιστώσασθαι. Contr. Eunom. lib. i. Appendix, p. 82. ed. 1615—18. tom. ii. p. 346. ed. 1638.

And to the Holy Scripture he distinctly appeals, as the Judge of controversies among Christians.

In his Treatise respecting the Trinity, he says of certain heretics,—“They charge us with introducing novel-ties, forming their accusation against us thus. When we confess three hypostases, they accuse us of saying that there is one goodness, one power, and one Godhead. And they affirm this not without reason. For such is our language. But they blame us for this, and object against us that the faith, as customably received among them, contains not this, and the Scripture does not agree with it. What, then, do we say to this? We do not think it just that the custom that prevails among them should be made the law and rule of right doctrine. For if the plea of custom is valid as a proof of the correctness of what is said, it will be lawful for us also, without doubt, to bring forward in opposition the custom that prevails among us. But if they repudiate this, neither doubtless can we be called upon to follow them. *Therefore let the inspired Scripture be the arbiter of the controversy between us, and the suffrage of the truth will, beyond doubt, fall to the lot of those whose doctrines shall be found agreeable to the divine words.*”¹ In these words, then, the Holy Scripture is clearly and distinctly put forward in that character to which Dr. Pusey and his party tell us it has no claim, and for a purpose which the same persons tell us it cannot fulfil, namely, as the proper

¹ Ἀλλὰ καινοτομίας ἡμῖν προφέρουσιν, οὕτωςι το ἐγκλημα καθ' ἡμῶν συντι-
θεντες· τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ὁμολογούντων, μίαν ἀγαθότητα, μίαν δύναμιν, καὶ μίαν
θεοτητα λεγείν ἡμᾶς αἰτιῶνται. Καὶ οὐκ ἐξω τοῦτο τῆς ἀληθείας φασὶν λεγόμεν
γὰρ, ἀλλ' [read φασὶν λεγόμεν γὰρ. Ἀλλ'] ἐγκαλοῦντες τοῦτο προφέρουσιν,
ὅτι ἡ συνηθεια αὐτῶν τοῦτο οὐκ ἐχει, καὶ ἡ γραφή οὐ συντιθεται. Τί αὖν καὶ πρὸς
τοῦτο ἡμεῖς; οὐ νομίζομεν δίκαιον εἶναι τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπικρατοῦσαν συνηθειαν
νόμον καὶ κανόνα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ ποιεῖσθαι λόγου. Εἰ γὰρ ἰσχυρὸν ἐστὶ εἰς ὀρθότητα
λόγου ἡ συνηθεια, ἐξεστὶ καὶ ἡμῖν παντὶς ἀντιπροβαλλέσθαι τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπι-
κρατοῦσαν συνηθειαν· εἰ δὲ παραγραφόνται ταύτην ἐκεῖνοι, οὐδὲ ἡμῖν παντὶς ἀκο-
λουητέον ἐκείνοις. Οὐκοῦν ἡ θεοπνεύστος ἡμῖν διαιτησατὼ γραφῇ, καὶ παρ' οἷς
ἀν' εὐρεθῇ τὰ δόγματα συνῶδα τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις, ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἤξει παντὶς τῆς ἀλη-
θείας ἡ ψήφος. De S. Trin. tom. ii. pp. 439, 40. ed. 1615—18. tom. iii. p. 8.
ed. 1638.

arbitrer of controversies among Christians. The appeal which those heretics made to the Scripture, saying that the orthodox doctrine was not agreeable to Scripture, did not for a moment prevent Gregory's appeal to it as the arbitrer of the controversy.

Nay more, he even speaks of it in one passage as our sole authoritative rule in points of ecclesiastical duty. In his treatise, "Respecting those who visit Jerusalem," he says,—“I assert that it is proper for those who have once dedicated themselves to a heavenly course of life, to refer in everything to the words of the gospel; and, as men shaping their work by a rule, reduce the crooked things in their hands to straightness by the straight line of the rule, so I think it proper that those persons applying to these things a certain right and immutable rule as it were, I mean the course of life laid down in the gospel, should shape their course to God by it. Since, therefore, there are some of those who have chosen for themselves a solitary life in retirement, by whom it has been determined to be a part of religion to see those places in Jerusalem in which are seen the evidences of our Lord's sojourn in the flesh, it would be well to look to *the rule*; and if the tendency of the precepts there given is such as to exhort us to it, to perform the act as a command of the Lord; but if it is not contained in the commands of the Lord, I know not what precept there is that a man becoming a law of what is good to himself, should desire to do something not commanded.”¹

¹ Εγὼ τοὺς ἀπ᾽ ἀνατρεθεικὸτας ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ὑψηλῇ πολιτείᾳ, καλῶς ἔχειν φημι πρὸς τὰς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διὰ παντὸς ἀποβλεπεῖν φώνας* καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ τῶ κανονι τοῦ ὑποκειμένου ἀπευθύνοντες, κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ κανονοῦ εὐθεῖαν τὰ σκολία τὰ ἐν χερσὶν εἰς εὐθυτητα μεταβαλλοῦσιν, οὕτως προσηκείν ἡγνοῦμαι οἶονε τινα κανονὰ ὀρθὸν καὶ ἀδιαστροφόν, τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν λεγῶ δὴ πολιτείαν, τοῦτοις ἐπιβάλλοντας, κατ' ἐκείνην πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀπευθύνεσθαι. Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν εἰσι τινες τῶν τὸν μονηρὴ καὶ ἰδιαζόντᾳ βίῳ ἐκπαινημένων, οἷς ἐν μέρει εὐσεβείας νενομίσται τὸ τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολυμοῖς τοποῦς ἰδεῖν, ἐν οἷς τὰ συμβολὰ τῆς διὰ σαρκὸς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ Κυρίου ὁράται, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι πρὸς τὸν κανονὰ βλέπειν καὶ εἰ τὰντα βουλευταὶ ἢ παρὰ τῶν ἐντολῶν χειραγωγία, ποιεῖν τὸ ἔργον, ὥς προσταγμὰ Κυρίου* εἰ δὲ ἐξω ἐστὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ Δεσποτοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα τί ἐστὶ τὸ διατεταγμένον τι θελεῖν ποιεῖν αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ καλοῦ νόμον γινόμενον. Orat. de iis qui adeunt Hierosol. tom. ii. p. 1084. ed. 1615—18. tom. iii. pp. 651, 2. ed. 1638.

Here, then, the Scripture is proposed to us as our rule, even in a more extended sense than that for which we are now contending.

In these passages, also, we must observe, that he places it before us as a perfect rule in respect of extent, that is, as embracing not only all the *necessary*, but *all* the doctrines of the Christian faith; as he does also in the following passage.

Speaking of a doctrine advanced by Eunomius, he says,—“ If, indeed, these are the doctrines of any of the heathen philosophers, let not the gospels, or the rest of the revelations of the inspired Scripture, be at all troubled about the matter; for what communion is there between the Christian doctrine and the wisdom that has become folly? [1 Cor. i. 22.] But if they depend upon the Scriptures, [as he manifestly thinks they ought to do, to the exclusion of all other authorities,] let him give an instance of such language from the holy writers, and we will be silent.”¹

There is, however, one passage in his writings, (I am not at present aware of more than one,) which requires a remark; but which, especially when taken in connexion with the passages we have just quoted, as of course it must in fairness be taken, admits of an easy and satisfactory explanation.

The passage occurs in one of his Orations against Eunomius, and is as follows;—“ Let no one murmur against me, and say that that also which is confessed by us needs to be certified *by a demonstration*. For it is sufficient as a proof of our doctrine, that we have the tradition that has come to us from our fathers transmitted as a sort of inheritance by succession *from the Apostles* through the succeeding saints. But they who have

¹ Εἰ μὲν οὖν τινι τῶν ἐξω σοφῶν ταῦτα δοκεῖ, μὴδεν ἐνοχλῆσθω τὰ εὐαγγέλια, μὴδὲ ἡ λοιπὴ τῆς θεοπνευστοῦ γραφῆς διδασκαλία. Τίς γὰρ κοινωνία τῷ Χριστιανῷ λόγῳ πρὸς τὴν μωρανθεῖσαν σοφίαν; εἰ δὲ τοῖς γραφικοῖς ἐπερεῖδεται, δείξατω τοιαυτὴν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων φωνήν, καὶ ἡμεῖς σιωπήσομεν. Id. Contr. Eunom. Orat. 9. tom. ii. p. 254. ed. 1615—18. Orat. 10. tom. ii. p. 682. ed. 1638.

changed the doctrines [of the gospel] to this new faith, would indeed need much aid *from argumentative reasonings*, if they should be anxious to bring over to their opinion not merely those who are easily excited and fickle-minded, but also those of a steady mind and fixed views. But while their doctrine is brought forward *destitute of foundation and proof*, who would be so foolish and brutish, as to make *the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles*, and those who successively shone in the Churches, of less weight than his idle prattle, which is destitute of *ALL evidence in its favour?*"¹

Now to understand this passage, we must observe that his opponents had been resting their doctrines upon *human reasonings and logical arguments*, and are charged by Gregory with having taken as the foundation of their statements positions the truth of which they had not even thus *demonstrated*.² Replying, then, by anticipation, to a similar charge against himself, he says, in the words we have quoted above, Let no one say that what I have advanced needs such a demonstration, because my doctrine is that of the Evangelists and Apostles, and therefore needs no such demonstration, as being founded upon the statements of persons inspired. And while he states, as a fact which he believed, that the doctrine he held had been transmitted through his ancestors from the Apostles,

¹ Και μοι μηδεις ὑποκρουετω και το παρ' ἡμῶν διομολογουμενον δια κατασκευης κυρωθῆναι· αρκει γαρ εις αποδειξιν του ἡμετερου λογου το εχειν πατροθεν ἡκουσαν προς ἡμᾶς την παραδοσιν, οιοινε τινα κληρον δι' ακολουθιας εκ των αποστολων δια των εφεξης ἁγιων παραπεμφθεντα· οἱ δε προς την καινοτητα ταυτην μετατιθεντες τα δογματα, πολλης αν δεοιντο της εκ των λογισμων συμμαχιας· ει μελοιεν μη τους κονιορτωθεις των ανθρωπων και εδριπιστους, αλλα και τους εμβριθεις τε και βεβηκοτας ταις διανοιαις προσαγεσθαι· ἕως δ' αν ακατασκευος αυτοις και αναποδεικτος ὁ λογος προφεροιτ'· ὡν, τις οὕτως ηλιθιος και κτηνωδης ὡς των ευαγγελιστων τε και αποστολων και των καθηξῃς εν ταις εκκλησιαις διαλαψαντων ασθενεστεραν την διδασκαλιαν της αναποδεικτου φλυαριας ποιησασθαι. Id. ib. orat. 2, pp. 126, 7. ed. 1615—18. orat. 3. pp. 554, 5. ed. 1638. I have taken the liberty in the last sentence of slightly altering the Editor's punctuation, which was most unaccountable as well as his version.

² Ουτος απο των αμφισβητουμενων αρχεται, και, ὡς αποδειγμενων, αρχην τω εφεξης διδωσι λογω. Id. ib. p. 126.

(and which we call not in question,) the only point on which he was insisting was, in reply to the objection that his doctrine needed *logical* demonstration, that being “the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles,” it needed no such proof of its truth. But if it had further been questioned whether his doctrine *really was* “the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles,” the passages we have quoted from him above clearly show to what he would have appealed as the Judge, namely, the testimony of Scripture. And his use of the words, “the Evangelists and Apostles,” the usual phrase with the Fathers for the New Testament, strongly confirms this view.

EPHRÆM SYRUS (fl. a. 370.)

“The end and aim of piety,” says Ephræm Syrus, “is clearly set before us; it consists, namely, in our believing *agreeably to the sacred declarations of the Gospels, and the rest of the Holy Scriptures*, giving ourselves up also to every good work, and to the cultivation of every virtue.”¹

And again, he sums up the Christian’s faith in a belief in “those things that are *written in the divine Scriptures*.”²

AMBROSE (fl. a. 374.)

We come next to Ambrose, whose testimony is as follows.

“*Trust to no one*,” he says, “*to guide you, but where the light of that lamp [i. e. Scripture] goes before*. For where you think it shines, there is a whirlpool; it seems to shine, but it defiles; and where you think that it is firm or dry, there it is slippery. And, moreover, if you

¹ Σκοπος της ευσεβειας προκειμενος εις το πιστευειν κατα τας ιερας των ευαγγελιων και των λοιπων αγιων γραφων επαγγελιας, επιδιδοντας εαυτους εις παν εργον αγαθον και εις πασαν αρετης επιτηδευσιν. EPHRÆM. SYR. Instit. ad Monach. Op. ed. Rom. 1732 &c. tom. iii. p. 325.

² Συ δε πιστευε, αγαπητε, τοις γεγραμμενοις εν ταυς θειας γραφαις. ID. In illud, Attende tibi ipsi. cap. 4. Ib. tom. i. p. 234.

have a lamp, the way is long. Therefore let faith be the guide of your journey; *let the divine Scripture be your path*. Excellent is the guidance of the heavenly word. From this lamp light your lamp; that the eye of your mind, which is the lamp of your body, may give light.”¹

Again, he says,—“I read that he is first, I read that he is not second; let those who say that he is second, show where they read it.”²

Again; “I would not, O sacred Emperor, that you should trust to argument, and any reasoning of mine; let us inquire *of the Scriptures*; let us interrogate the Apostles; let us interrogate the Prophets; let us interrogate Christ.”³

So far from making his interpretation of Scripture part of the rule of faith, as derived from “tradition,” or on any other ground, he entreats the emperor not to trust to his explanation of the matter, but to go to Scripture as that upon which alone his faith should be founded, and make Scripture the judge of the controversy.

And to the same effect he speaks in other places of the same work.⁴ As also elsewhere. “I would not that my statement should be trusted, let the Scripture be recited.”⁵

Other passages might be quoted confirmatory of the same view.⁶

¹ Nulli credas tuum, nisi praeunte lucernae istius luce, processum. Nam ubi putas quod luceat, gurgis est: videtur lucere sed polluit: et ubi putas solidum esse vel siccum, ibi lubricum est. Sed et si lucerna tibi, iter longius sit. Sit ergo fides tibi itineris tui praevia, sit tibi iter Scriptura divina. Bonus est caelestis ductus eloquii. Ex hac lucerna accende et tu lucernam; ut luceat interior oculus tuus, qui lucerna est tui corporis. AMBROS. In Psalm. 118. Serm. 14. § 11. Op. tom. i. col. 1143. ed. Bened. Paris. 1686.

² Lego quia primus est, lego quia non est secundus. Illi qui secundum aiunt, doceant lectione. ID. De instit. virg. c. 11. i. 265.

³ Sed nolo argumento credas, sancte Imperator, et nostrae disputationi: Scripturas interrogemus, interrogemus apostolos, interrogemus prophetas, interrogemus Christum. ID. De fide lib. 1. c. 6. ii. 451.

⁴ See ib. c. 16. ii. 464.

⁵ Nolo nobis credatur, Scriptura recitetur. ID. De incarn. Dominic. Sacram. c. 3. ii. 706.

⁶ See in Psalm. 118. Serm. 8. § 59. i. 1078. et Expos. Evang. sec. Luc. lib. 8. § 19. i. 1474.

And, as it respects more particularly the exclusiveness and completeness of Scripture as our only divine revelation, he says, "How can we use those things which we do not find in the Holy Scriptures?"¹

Again, more pointedly, commenting on Matth. xxi. 12 (or Luke xix. 45) he says, "The Lord's money is the divine Scripture; for when about to depart, he distributed pence to his servants, and divided talents; and for the cure of the wounded man, left two pieces of money to the keeper of the inn; for, *by the two Testaments, our wounds are cured.*"²

Similar passages might easily be added.³

And here we may notice also that, as it respects the *full* delivery of the Nicene doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the author of the Treatise, "On the orthodox faith against the Arians," attributed to Ambrose, and admitted by the Benedictines to be an antient and beautiful treatise, and referred to by Augustine, observes,—“Since, therefore, you may recognize this unity of substance in the Father and Son, not only by Prophetic but by Evangelical authority [passages from the prophets and the Gospel of John having been quoted in proof of it], how say you that ‘consubstantial’ is not found in the divine Scriptures; as if ‘consubstantial’ was anything else than what he says, ‘I came forth from God the Father,’ and ‘I and the Father are one;’ or what the prophets clearly intimate as to the substance of God?”⁴

¹ Quæ in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possumus? Id. De offic. Ministr. lib. 1. c. 23. ii. 29.

² Pecunia Domini Scriptura divina est; nam et denarios servis distribuit profecturus, et talenta divisit, et pro sanitate hominis vulnerati duo æra stabulario dereliquit; duobis enim Testamentis vulnera nostra curantur. Id. Expos. Evang. sec. Luc. lib. 9. § 18. i. 1498.

³ See De Paradiso, c. 12. i. 171. et Expos. in Psalm. 118. Serm. 18. § 37. i. 1206.

⁴ Cum ergo hanc unitatem substantiæ in Patre et Filio non solum Prophetica sed et Evangelica auctoritate cognoscas, quomodo dicis in Scripturis divinis ὁμοουσιον non inveniri, quasi aliud sit ὁμοουσιον quam quod dicit, Ego de

JEROME (fl. a. 378.)

We pass on to the celebrated Jerome.

"Our care is," says Jerome, "to speak, not what each may be able or willing to speak, but what the Scriptures direct."¹

"When anything appears to you harsh in my work, do not look at my words, but at Scripture, whence my words are derived."²

"It is to be proved by us, by the testimonies of the Holy Scriptures, in which God speaks every day to those who believe."³

"Lest you should cavil at all," he says to Helvidius, "and writhe yourself like a slippery snake, you must be bound by the chains of testimonies, lest you querulously murmur, and say that you are overcome rather by tortuous argumentations, than by the truth of Scriptures."⁴ And this remark, be it observed, is made respecting a point which is expressly instanced by the Tractators as one that depends upon "tradition," and in which "tradition" is a sufficient informant, namely, the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord.

Again; "Moreover, since the Lord's flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed, by consequence we have this only good in the present life, to feed upon his flesh

Patre exivi, et, Ego et Pater unum sumus; vel quod prophetæ ex aperto substantiam Dei intimabant? De fide orthodoxa contr. Arian. c. 5. Inter op. AMBROS. Tom. 2. App. Col. 351, 2.

¹ Nobis curæ est, non quod unusquisque possit aut velit, sed quid Scripturæ præcipiant dicere. *HIERON. Ep. ad Pammach. contr. Jovin. ep. 48. § 15. Op. ed. Vallars. Venet. 1766, &c. Tom. i. col. 228.*

² Quando aliquid tibi asperum videtur in nostro opusculo, non ad mea verba respicias, sed ad Scripturam, unde mea tracta sunt verba. *Id. ib. § 20. i. 233.*

³ Quod nobis sanctarum Scripturarum testimoniis asserendum est, in quibus quotidie credentibus loquitur Deus. *Id. Ep. ad Ctesiph. ep. 133. § 13. i. 1042.*

⁴ Ne in aliquo cavilleris, et te quasi lubricus anguis evolvas, testimoniorum stringendus es vinculis, ne querulus sibilis et dicas, te magis argumentationibus tortuosis quam Scripturarum veritate superatum. *Id. Adv. Helvid. § 14. ii. 221.*

and drink his blood, not only sacramentally, but also in the reading of the Scriptures. For the true meat and drink which is taken from the word of God, is the knowledge of the Scriptures.”¹

“*The error, neither of parents nor ancestors, is to be followed; but the authority of the Scriptures, and the government of God as our teacher.*”²

“All the questions raised by the heretics and the heathen are the same, *because they do not follow the authority of the Scriptures, but the sense of human reason.*”³

“For all questions let us seek for suitable beams from the testimonies of the Scriptures, and cut them down, and build the house of wisdom within us.”⁴

A still more remarkable testimony occurs in his comment on Haggai, where he thus speaks. “The other things, also, which they find and feign, of themselves, *without the authority and testimonies of the Scriptures, AS IF BY APOSTOLICAL TRADITION*, the sword of God [the word of God in the Scriptures] strikes down.”⁵

Again; “They therefore err, because they know not the Scriptures; and because they are ignorant of the Scriptures, they consequently know not the power of God; that is, Christ, who is the power of God, and the wisdom of God.”⁶

¹ Porro quia caro Domini verus est cibus, et sanguis ejus verus est potus, juxta *αναγωγην* hoc solum habemus in præsenti sæculo bonum, si vescamur carne ejus et cruore potemur, non solum in Mysterio sed etiam in Scripturarum lectione. Verus enim cibus et potus, qui ex verbo Dei sumitur, scientia Scripturarum est. Id. In Eccles. c. 3. iii. 413.

Nec parentum nec majorum error sequendus est; sed auctoritas Scripturarum et Dei docentis imperium. Id. In Jerem. c. 9. vv. 12—14. iv. 907.

³ Omnes hæreticorum et gentilium quæstiones eadem sunt, quia non Scripturarum auctoritatem sed humanæ rationis sensum sequuntur. Id. In Os. c. 7. vi. 80, 81.

⁴ Ad singula problemata, congrua de testimoniis Scripturarum ligna quærentes, præcidamus ea, et ædificemus domum sapientiæ in nobis. Id. In Agg. c. 1. vv. 7, 8. vi. 747.

⁵ Sed et alia quæ absque auctoritate et testimoniis Scripturarum quasi traditione Apostolica sponte reperiunt atque confingunt, percutit gladius Dei [i. e. sermo Dei]. Id. In Aggæum c. 1. vv. 11, 12. vi. 749.

⁶ Propterea errant, quia Scripturas nesciunt; et quia Scripturas ignorant, consequenter nesciunt virtutem Dei, hoc est, Christum qui est Dei virtus et Dei sapientia. Id. In Matth. c. 22. v. 29. vii. 178.

And again, on the question who the Zacharias, son of Barachias, was, who is mentioned Matt. xxiii., he says, "Some think that Zacharias, the father of John, is to be understood; proving it from some dreams of Apocryphal writers, that he was put to death, because he preached the advent of the Saviour. But this, *as it has no authority from the Scriptures*, is as easily despised as proved."¹ A passage which tends strongly to show where alone he considered himself able to place confidence, even for such points as these.

I add a reference below² to some other confirmatory passages.

Moreover, he distinctly refers to Scripture, not only as able to be the judge of controversies, and determine them, but as the judge to which we ought to resort, to distinguish between true and false doctrines.

"The arguments of the heretics," he says, "and through them of the philosophers, may be answered by a few short sentences of the Scriptures."³

"There is no argument that is so forcible, as a passage from the Holy Scriptures."⁴

"We may spiritually say, when they persecute us in one city, that is, in one book or testimony of the Scriptures, let us fly to other cities, that is, to other books."⁵ We are not to go to tradition, when the heretics try to wrest passages of Scripture from us, but to other parts of Scripture.

¹ Alii Zachariam patrem Joannis intelligi volunt, ex quibusdam apocryphorum somniis approbantes, quod propterea occisus sit, quia Salvatoris prædicavit adventum. Hoc quia de Scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur qua probatur. Id. In Matth. c. 23. vv. 35, 6. vii. 190.

² See Pref. in Expos. Isai. iv. 1, 2. In Mich. c. 7. vv. 5—7. vi. 520. In Naum c. 3. vv. 18, 19. vi. 585, 6. In Matth. c. 21. v. 43. vii. 171. In Tit. c. 1. vv. 10, 11. vii. 704.

³ Paucis sententiolis Scripturarum possint hæreticorum et per eos philosophorum argumenta convinci. Id. Ep. ad Ctesiph. ep. 133. § 2. i. 1027.

⁴ Nihil ita percipit ut exemplum de Scripturis sanctis. Id. In Zach. c. 10. vv. 15, 16. vi. 868.

⁵ Spiritualiter possumus dicere; quum persequuti nos fuerint in una civitate, hoc est in uno Scripturarum libro vel testimonio, nos fugiamus ad alias civitates, id est, ad alia volumina. Id. In Matth. c. 10. vv. 23, 4. vii. 61.

Again, still more clearly;—"Blasphemy is produced, if . . . he who is in the Church and believes in God, errs in doctrines which it is not lawful to be ignorant of; thinking differently of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, than the truth of the matter itself requires; not believing in the resurrection of the dead, according to what the Scriptures teach *Whence the Scriptures are to be read by us with all earnestness; and we should meditate in the law of the Lord day and night, that as experienced moneychangers, we may know which is good money, and which bad.*"¹ A more decisive testimony to the point, could hardly be penned.

Further, his testimonies to the fulness and perfection of Scripture, are clear and distinct. "The doctrine of the Church," he says, "which is the house of God, may be found in the fulness of the divine books."²

"As we deny not these things that are written, so we reject those things that are not written. That God was born of a virgin we believe, because we read it; that Mary married after the birth we believe not, because we read it not."³ The instance, with respect to which these words were spoken, may show us how *comprehensive* is the sense in which they were uttered.

Again; "The Church of Christ, which is in a flourishing state, and possessing Churches throughout the whole world, is joined together by unity of spirit, and has the cities of the Law, the Prophets, the Gospel, and the

¹ Blasphemia . . profertur, si in Ecclesia constitutus et credens in Deum labatur in dogmatibus quæ ignorare non licitum est: aliter de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto sentiens quam rei ipsius veritas habet: non ita credens in resurrectione mortuorum ut Scripturæ docent Unde omni studio legendæ nobis Scripturæ sunt, et in Lege Domini meditandum die ac nocte; ut probati trapezitæ sciamus quis nummus probus sit, quis adulter. *Id.* In Ephes. c. 4. v. 31. vii. 637.

² Doctrina Ecclesiæ, quæ domus Dei est, in librorum reperiatur plenitudine divinorum. *Id.* Ep. ad Paulum, ep. 30. § 6. i. 149.

³ Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt, non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta, renuimus. Natum Deum esse de Virgine credimus quia legimus; Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus quia non legimus. *Id.* Adv. Helvid. § 19. ii. 226, 7.

Apostles, has not gone out of her own borders, that is, from the Holy Scriptures."¹

Again; "That storehouse in which are hid *all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge* [Col. ii.] is either God the Word, who seems hidden in the flesh of Christ, or *the Holy Scriptures*, in which the knowledge of the Saviour is laid up."²

And lastly, he tells us that the whole doctrine, by which we become acquainted with God, and are not left ignorant why we are created, is contained in the divine books,³ and that God hath made known to us all the mysteries of religion by his Scriptures.⁴

How all these testimonies can be explained away, I do not understand.

And as to any notion of even the existence of catholic consent, we have already shown⁵ that he entertained no such idea. And to the passages there mentioned, we may add, that when speaking elsewhere of Origen, he says,—"*Others also, as well Greeks as Latins, have erred in the faith . . . I read him [Origen] as others; because he has erred like others;*"⁶ and hence he says, in another place, with reference to *the daughter* of the person he was addressing, after having mentioned Cyprian, Athanasius,

¹ Ecclesiam [Ecclesia] autem Christi, quæ habitat bene, et in toto orbe ecclesias possidet, [possidens, *Erasm.*] spiritus unitate conjuncta est, et habet urbes Legis, Prophetarum, Evangelii et Apostolorum, non est egressa de finibus suis, id est, de Scripturis sanctis. Id. in Mich. c. 1. vv. 10 & s. vi. 444, 5.

² Thesaurus iste in quo sunt omnes thesauri sapientiæ et scientiæ absconditi [Col. 2.] aut Deus Verbum est qui in carne Christi videtur absconditus, aut sanctæ Scripturæ, in quibus reposita est notitia Salvatoris. Id. In Matth. c. 13. v. 44. vii. 97.

³ Quum . . . ratio omnis et sermo divinis libris contineatur per quos et Deum discimus, et quare creati sumus, non ignoramus; miror quosdam extitisse, &c. Id. Præf. in Comm. in Ephes. vii. 537, 8.

⁴ Per Scripturas suas nobis nota fecerit universa mysteria. Id. In Ephes. c. 1. v. 9. vii. 555.

⁵ See pp. 267, 8, above.

⁶ Erraverunt in fide alii tam Græci quam Latini . . . Sic legam ut cæteros, quia sic erravit ut cæteri. Id. Ep. ad Pammach. et Ocean. ep. 84. § 8. i. 530.

and Hilary, "The rest let her so read as rather to *judge*, than to follow them."¹

THEOPHILUS OF ALEXANDRIA (fl. a. 385.)

Let us proceed to another able and excellent witness, Theophilus of Alexandria.

He tells us that "it would be the instigation of a demoniacal spirit to follow the conceits of the human mind, and to think anything divine, beyond what has the authority of the Scriptures;"² which entirely disposes of the claims set up for ecclesiastical tradition as a *divine* informant.

As to the claims of Scripture, as the sole authoritative rule of faith, he speaks thus;—

"It is another thing if they can show, from the Scriptures, that God the Word had this soul before he was born of Mary; and that it was called his soul, before his assumption of flesh. But if they are compelled, *both by the authority of the Scriptures, and by reason itself*, to believe that Christ had not a soul before he was born of Mary, (for, in the assumption of human nature, his soul also was assumed) they are evidently convicted of saying that the same soul was his, and not his. But let them cease, in their madness, from the impiety of these new doctrines. We, *following the rule of the Scriptures*, will proclaim, with the whole energy of our hearts, that neither his flesh nor soul existed before he was born of Mary."³

¹ Cæteros sic legat, ut magis judicet quam sequatur. *Id.* Ep. ad Lætam. ep. 107. § 12. i. 688. See also similar observations in his Ep. ad Tranquillinum, ep. 62. § 2. i. 352. et Comment. in Agg. c. i. vi. 750.

² Dæmoniacy spiritus esset instinctus, sophismata humanarum mentium sequi, et aliquid extra Scripturarum auctoritatem putare divinum. *THEOPHIL. ALEX.* Epist. Paschal. i. § 6. in Biblioth. Vet. Patrum, ed. Galland. tom. 7. p. 617.

³ Aliud est, si possunt de Scripturis docere, antequam nasceretur ex Maria, habuisse hanc animam Deum Verbum, et ante carnis adsumptionem animam illius nuncupatam. Quod si et auctoritate Scripturarum et ipsa suscipere ratione coguntur, Christum non habuisse animam antequam de Maria nasceretur (in adsumptione enim hominis et anima ejus adsumpta est) perspicue convincuntur eandem animam et illius et non illius fuisse dicere. Sed cessent illi a novorum dogmatum impietate furibundi. Nos Scripturarum normam

“Wherefore, if they wish to celebrate with the Church the feast of Easter, let those who prefer the dreams of Origen, *to the authority of the Scriptures*, hear God saying, &c.”¹

“As the most impious of the heathen prefer error and custom to truth, making idols after the likeness of men . . . so Origen, through the easiness and impiety of believers, hath let fall in his works [observations that are,] as it were, temples of idols; which we subverting *by the authority of the Scriptures*, and the zeal of faith, may use this similitude; for, as masons wishing to build a house four-square, measure out walls in all respects equal, and shaping them by line and rule, build what they intended; and join the four equal sides by a square at the angles at the top and bottom, preserving the same proportion throughout, so that beauty of work may be united with diversity of materials, and the angular lines may be secured by the art with which the building is constructed; so the teachers of the Church, having the testimony of the Scriptures, make the foundations of doctrine immovable, and remain fearless; presenting their works to Christ, and saying, ‘Strengthen me in thy words.’ [Ps. cxxviii. 28.]”²

sequentes, tota cordis audacia prædicemus, quod nec caro illius nec anima fuerint priusquam de Maria nasceretur. Id. in Epist. Paschal. 2a. § 8. ead. ed. p. 626.

¹ Quapropter si volunt cum Ecclesia Dominicum Pascha celebrare, qui auctoritati Scripturarum Origenis præferunt deliramenta, audiant inclamantem Deum, &c. Id. in Epist. Paschal. 2a. § 19. p. 630.

² Sicut ethnicorum impiissimi errorem et consuetudinem præferunt veritati, fabricantes in hominum similitudinem idola . . . ita Origenes facilitate et impietate credentium, quasi delubra idolorum, tractatum suorum monimentis demisit, quæ nos auctoritate Scripturarum et zelo [? telo] fidei subvertentes, utamur illa similitudine: ut enim cæmentarii quadram volentes ædificare domum, æquales ex omni parte parietes metiuntur, eosque norma et perpendiculari dirigentes quod animo depinxerint opere exstruunt; et ejusdem mensuræ per quadrum latera quatuor jungunt angulis sursum ac deorsum, coeptam æqualitatem paullatimque incrementa servantes, ut materiæ diversitatem jungat operis pulcritudo, et angulares lineas artifex structura custodiat; sic ecclesiæ præceptores habentes testimonia Scripturarum firma doctrinæ faciunt fundamenta, et intrepidi permanent, offerentes opera sua Christo, atque dicentes, ‘Confirma me in verbis tuis.’ [Ps. 128. 28.] Id. in Epist. Paschal. 3a. § 13. p. 637.

Again;—"As the helmsmen of great ships, when they see an immense wave coming from the deep, as hunters with a fierce wild beast, meet the foaming billows, and bear up against them, by opposing to them the prow, turning the rudders in the opposite direction so they who have a regard for their own safety, imitate this example, *and using the revelation of the divine words as a rudder, meet the tempest and the waves of heretics*, the law of God serving them in the place of skill; that those who had fallen may be raised, those who stand may stand firm, and all together may be preserved by the aid of its doctrine. **FOR WHAT THE RUDDER IS TO THE HELMSMAN, THAT THE LAW OF GOD IS TO THE SOUL.**"¹

RUFINUS (fl. a. 390.)

Rufinus, after enumerating the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, adds these words, "These are the books which the Fathers have included within the canon; *and out of these they intended that the articles of our faith should be framed.*"²

And a little further on he tells us, that in these alone is to be found *the word of God*, knowing nothing of *tradition* as another divine informant. "It appeared fit," he says, "to point out in this place these things which have been delivered to us by our Fathers, for the instruction of those who are receiving the first principles of the Church and

¹ Sicut enim gubernatores magnarum navium, cum viderint immensum ex alto venire gurgitem, quasi venatores ferocissimam bestiam, spumantes fluctus suscipiunt, eosque proræ objectione sustentant, flectentes in diversum gubernacula qui sui curam gerunt imitantur exempli similitudinem, et divinorum dispensatione verborum quasi gubernaculo utentes, occurrunt hæreticorum tempestati et fluctibus, legem Dei pro arte retinentes, ut qui corruerant, suscitentur; qui stant, firmo perseverent gradu, et omnes in commune doctrinæ opitulatione serventur. Quod enim gubernatori clavus, hoc animo est lex Dei. Id. in Epist. Paschal. 3a. § 14. pp. 637, 8.

Hæc sunt [i. e. volumina] quæ Patres intra Canonem concluderunt, ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt. RUFINI Expos. Symb. Art. ult. (Ed. ad calc. Cypriani, Col. 1617. p. 319.)

faith, that they may know what are the sources out of which they may draw for themselves *the word of God*.”¹

AUGUSTINE (fl. a. 396.)

The next Father to whom we would direct the reader's attention, is the celebrated Augustine, whose testimony as it respects points of faith, is without exception wholly with us.

“*Against ensnaring errors*,” he says, “God was pleased to lay down *a firm support* in the Scriptures; against which no one dares to speak, who at all desires to appear a Christian.”²

“Let our writings be put out of sight; let the book of God be brought forward; hear Christ's words, hear the truth speaking,” referring to Luke xxiv. 47.³

“As the night extinguishes not the stars in heaven, so iniquity overcomes not the minds of the faithful, while cleaving to the firm foundation of God's Scripture.”⁴

“Since, therefore, in every question that concerns life and manners, not doctrine only, but exhortation also is necessary, that by doctrine we may know what is to be done, and by exhortation we may be roused to action, lest we should be slow to do what we know ought to be done, what can I teach you more than that which we read in the Apostle. For the holy Scripture *fixes the rule of our doctrine*, that we should not presume to be wise beyond what we ought to be; but, as he says, let us be wise so-

¹ Hæc nobis a Patribus tradita opportunum visum est hoc in loco designare ad instructionem eorum qui prima sibi Ecclesiæ ac fidei elementa suscipiunt, ut sciant, ex quibus sibi fontibus verbi Dei haurienda sint pocula. Ib. p. 320.

² Contra insidiosos errores Deus voluit ponere firmamentum in Scripturis, contra quas nullus audet loqui, qui quoquo modo se vult videri Christianum. AUGUST. In Ep. Johann. tract. 2. § 1. tom. iii. Part. 2. col. 836. ed. Bened. Par. 1679, et seq.

³ Auferantur de medio chartæ nostræ, procedat in medium codex Dei; audi Christum dicentem, audi veritatem loquentem [Luc. 24. 47]. ID. Enarr. in Ps. 57. v. 4. § 6. iv. 545.

⁴ Sicut stellas in cælo non extinguit nox, sic mentes fidelium inhærentes firmamento Scripturæ Dei non vincit iniquitas. ID. Enarr. in Ps. 94. § 29. iv. 1021.

berly, as God hath given to each the measure of faith. Therefore I desire not otherwise to teach you, than to expound to you the words of the teacher; and *from them* to discuss what the Lord has given.”¹

“The Lord having spoken, first by the prophets, then by himself, afterwards by the Apostles, as much as he judged to be sufficient, formed also the Scripture, which is called canonical, to be of pre-eminent authority, in which we place our faith, as it respects those things which it is not expedient for us to be ignorant of, and which we are not sufficient of ourselves to obtain the knowledge of.”²

“The city of God believes also the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which we call canonical; *whence that faith itself takes its rise, by which the just lives*; and by which we walk without hesitation, as long as we are absent from the Lord; and which being preserved safe and secure, we may, without just blame, doubt concerning some things which we have not perceived by sense or reason, and which have not been clearly manifested to us by the canonical Scripture, nor come under our knowledge by witnesses whom we cannot, without absurdity, disbelieve.”³

¹ Cum igitur in omni quæstione quæ ad vitam moresque pertinet non sola doctrina verum etiam exhortatio sit necessaria, ut doctrina quid agendum sit noverimus, exhortatione autem excitemur, ne pigeat agere quod agendum esse jam novimus, quid ego amplius te doceam quam id quod apud Apostolum legimus? Sancta enim Scriptura nostræ doctrinæ regulam figit, ne audeamus sapere plus quam oportet sapere; sed sapiamus, ut ipse ait, [Rom. xii. 3.] ad temperantiam, sicut unicuique Deus partitus est mensuram fidei. Non sit ergo mihi aliud te docere, nisi verba tibi doctoris exponere, et de iis quod Dominus dederit disputare. ID. De bono viduit. c. l. vi. 369, 370.

² Hic prius per prophetas, deinde per seipsum, postea per Apostolos, quantum satis esse iudicavit, locutus, etiam Scripturam condidit, quæ canonica nominatur, eminentissimæ auctoritatis, cui fidem habemus de his rebus quas ignorare non expedit, nec per nosmetipsos nosse idonei sumus. ID. De civ. Dei, lib. 11. c. 3. vii. 273.

³ Credit etiam [i. e. Civitas Dei] Scripturis sanctis et veteribus et novis, quas canonicas appellamus, unde fides ipsa concepta est, ex qua justus vivit; per quam sine dubitatione ambulamus, quamdiu peregrinamur a Domino; qua salva atque certa, de quibusdam rebus, quas neque sensu neque ratione

"Being about to speak of the day of God's last judgment . . . we ought first to place, as the foundation of the edifice, the divine testimonies."¹

Again, in his controversy with Maximinus the Arian, he says,—“But now neither ought I to produce the Council of Nice, nor you that of Ariminum, as if we could thus determine the question beforehand. Neither am I held by the authority of the one, nor you by the authority of the other. Let the points, and causes, and reasons on both sides contend against each other, with authorities of the Scriptures, witnesses not belonging exclusively to either of us, but common to both.”² “By which words,” as the Tractators’ own witness, Bishop Taylor, remarks, “if St. Austin’s affirmative can prevail, it is certain that nothing ought to be pretended for argument but Scripture, in matters of religion. For if a general Council, which is the best witness of tradition, the best expounder of Scripture, the best determiner of a question, is not a competent measure of determination, then certainly nothing else can pretend to it, nothing but Scripture. And if it be replied, that this is only affirmed by him, in case that two Councils are, or seem contrary, I answer that if Councils can be, or seem contrary, so that wise and good men cannot competently insist upon their testimony, it is certain a man may be deceived, or cannot justly be determined, by any topic but the words and consequences of Scripture; and if this be the only probation, then it is sufficient, that is certain . . . That which I intend to persuade by these testimonies is, that the

percepimus, neque nobis per Scripturam canonicam claruerunt, nec per testes quibus non credere absurdum est, in nostram notitiam pervenerunt, sine justa reprehensione dubitamus. Id. *De civ. Dei*, lib. 19. c. 18. vii. 562.

¹ *De die ultimi judicii Dei locuturi . . . tamquam in ædificii fundamento prius ponere testimonia divina debemus.* Id. *De civ. Dei*, lib. 20. c. 1. vii. 573.

² *Sed nunc nec ego Nicænum, nec tu debes Ariminense, tamquam præjudicaturus, proferre concilium. Nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris: Scripturarum auctoritatibus, non quorumque propriis, sed utrisque communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet.* Id. *Contr. Maximin. Arian.* lib. 2. c. 14. viii. 704.

Fathers of the primitive Church did, in all their mysterious inquiries of religion, *in all matters of faith and manners*, admit no argument, but what was derived from Scripture."¹

Again; "Let us not produce deceitful balances where we may weigh out what we like, and how we like, saying, as we please, This is heavy, this is light; but let us produce *the divine balance from the Holy Scriptures*, as from the Lord's treasures; and in it let us weigh out and prove what may be heavy, or rather let us not ourselves weigh it out, but acknowledge what has been weighed out by the Lord."²

So to the Donatists he says,—“Read this to us from the Law, from the Prophets, from the Psalms, from the Gospel itself, from the Apostolical writings; read it, and we believe.”—“Let them read this to us from the Holy Scriptures, and we believe.”—The Holy Scriptures are “the proofs, the foundations, the supports of our cause.”³

And “according to these [i. e. the books of the Prophets and Apostles],” he says, “we may freely judge of other writings, either of the faithful, or of unbelievers . . . That which agrees with the authority of the divine Scriptures in the writings of Cyprian, I accept to his praise; that which does not so agree, I reject without any offence to him.”⁴

¹ Rule of Cons. ii. 3. 14. Works, xiii. 101, 2.

² Non afferamus stateras dolosas, ubi appendamus quod volumus, et quomodo volumus, pro arbitrio nostro dicentes, Hoc grave, hoc leve est : sed afferamus divinam stateram de Scripturis sanctis tamquam de thesauris Dominicis, et in illa quid sit gravius appendamus, immo non appendamus, sed a Domino appensa recognoscamus. Id. De bapt. contr. Donat. lib. 2. c. 6. ix. 101.

³ Legite nobis hoc de Lege, de Prophetis, de Psalmis, de ipso Evangelio, de Apostolicis litteris; legite et credimus. Id. Ep. ad Cathol. *vulgo* De unit. Eccles. c. 6. ix. 345. Hoc nobis legant de Scripturis sanctis et credimus. Ib. c. 17. col. 368. Hæc sunt causæ nostræ documenta, hæc fundamenta, hæc firmamenta. Ib. c. 19. col. 373.

⁴ Secundum quos [i. e. Prophetarum et Apostolorum libros] de ceteris litteris vel fidelium vel infidelium libere judicemus Quod in eis [i. e. litteris Cypriani] divinarum Scripturarum auctoritati congruit, cum laude ejus accipio, quod autem non congruit, cum pace ejus respuo. Id. contr. Cresc. Donat. lib. 2. cc. 31, 32. ix. 430.

"Where we are disputing on a very obscure point, in which we have not *certain and clear proofs from the Divine Scriptures* to aid us, human presumption ought to restrain itself, doing nothing by leaning to one side."¹

"Although I should not be able to refute their arguments, I see, nevertheless, that I must cleave close to those things that are most manifest in the Scriptures, that from these the obscure may be cleared."²

And he says that he considered himself perfectly free to judge for himself in the writings of any men whatsoever of the Catholics themselves, inasmuch as he owed unreserved consent only to the canonical Scriptures.³

Further ; Scripture is a complete and perfect rule, according to Augustine.

"Whatever Christ wished us to read of his deeds and words, this he directed his Apostles to write, as it were, with his own hands."⁴

"The Lord Jesus having done many things, they are not all written, as the same St. John the Evangelist testifies, that the Lord Christ said and did many things that are not written ; but those were chosen for *writing*, which appeared to be *sufficient for the salvation* of those who should believe."⁵

¹ Ubi de re obscurissima disputatur, non adjuvantibus divinarum Scripturarum certis clarisque documentis, cohibere se debet humana præsumtio, nihil faciens in partem alteram declinando. Id. De peccat. merit. et remiss. c. 36. x. 70. See also lib. 3. c. 10. ib. col. 80.

² Ego etsi refellere istorum argumenta non valeam, video tamen inhærendum esse iis quæ in Scripturis sunt apertissima, ut ex his revelentur obscura. Id. De peccat. merit. et remiss. lib. 3. c. 4. x. 74.

³ Maxime quoniam me in hujusmodi quorumlibet hominum [i. e. *catholicorum tractatorum*] scriptis liberum, quia solis canonicis debeo sine ulla recusatione consensum, nihil movet quod de illius scriptis, cujus nomen non ibi inveni, ille posuit. Id. De nat. et grat. contra Pelag. c. 61. x. 158.

⁴ Quidquid ille [Christus] de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis [Apostolis] tamquam suis manibus imperavit. Id. De consens. Evangel. lib. i. c. 35. iii. Part. 2. col. 26.

⁵ Cum multa fecisset Dominus Jesus, non omnia scripta sunt, sicut idem ipse sanctus Johannes Evangelista testatur, multa Dominum Christum et dixisse et fecisse quæ scripta non sunt ; electa sunt autem quæ scriberentur quæ salutis credentium sufficere videbantur. Id. In Johann. Evang. c. 11. Tract. 49. § 1. iii. Part. 2. col. 619.

“He hath appointed the authors of the Divine Scriptures to be the mountains of Israel. *There feed, that you may feed with safety. Whatever ye shall hear from thence, let it be acceptable to you; whatever is not in them, reject.*”¹

“In the divine Scripture is contained the Christian erudition.”²

Nay more; “*In those things that are laid down plainly in Scripture, are found all those things that contain faith and manners of life;*”³ where Bellarmine admits that his words apply to those things that are simply necessary to all, naming the Creed and the Commandments, hoping thereby to leave room for his “traditions;”⁴ but there is no such limitation in the words of Augustine; and if there were, they would include several points, for which both Romanists and Tractators send us to “tradition;” as, for instance, the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father; a doctrine, indeed, which, as we have already seen,⁵ Augustine considers but equivalent to what is expressed in so many words in Scripture.

Once more, he says,—“Either with respect to Christ or his Church, or anything else whatever that pertains to your faith or life, I will not say, ‘We,’ because we are by no means to be compared to him who said, ‘Although we;’ but certainly I will say what he has followed it up with; If an angel from heaven shall have preached to you anything *beyond what ye have received in the Scriptures of the Law and the Gospel*, let him be anathema.”⁶

¹ Constituit montes Israel auctores Scripturarum divinarum. Ibi pascite, ut secure pascatis. Quidquid inde audieritis, hoc vobis bene sapiat; quidquid extra est, respuite. Serm. De Pastor. serm. 46, c. 11. v. 238.

² Scriptura divina, qua Christiana eruditio continetur. Id. De civ. Dei, lib. 9. c. 5. vii. 222.

³ In iis quæ aperte in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi. Id. De doct. Christian. lib. 2. c. 9. iii. Part. 1. col. 24.

⁴ De verb. Dei, lib. 4. c. 11.

⁵ In Joh. Evang. c. 16. Tract. 97. § 4. iii. Part. 2. col. 738. See p. 9 above.

⁶ Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacumque alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque vestram, non dicam nos, nequaquam compa-

To this passage, the only reply that Bellarmine can make is, that the word *præter*, *beyond* or *besides*, here means *contra*, *against*; "a novelty," as Bishop Taylor says, "taken up without reason, but not without great need;" adding, "That St. Austin did not mean only to reprove them that introduced into faith and manners such things which were against Scripture, but such which were besides it, and whatsoever was not in it, is plain by an established doctrine of his, affirming that 'all things which appertain to life and doctrine, are found in those things which are plainly set down in the Scriptures.'"¹

We conclude, therefore, in the words of the same learned Prelate, that, "By St. Austin's doctrine the Scripture hath enough for every one, and in all cases of necessary religion; and much more than what is necessary; nay, *there is nothing besides it that can come into our rule.*"²

Moreover, the Holy Scripture is continually referred to by Augustine, as the Supreme Judge of controversies.

This is sufficiently apparent, from the passages already adduced; especially that from his book against Maximinus the Arian, where he puts aside even the Council of Nice, and constitutes Scripture the sole judge of the controversy. But there are many other similar testimonies in his writings.

Thus, in the controversy with the Pelagians as to the guilt of infants, he says,—“That controversy requires a judge. Therefore let Christ judge,” proceeding to quote

randi ei qui dixit, Licet si nos, sed omninò quod secutus adjecit, Si angelus de cœlo vobis annuntiaverit præter quam quod in Scripturis legalibus et evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit. *Id.* Contr. litt. Petil. lib. 3. c. 6. ix. 301. See also Epist. ad Madaur. ep. 232. § 3. ii. 843. Omnia quæ præteritis temporibus, &c. A similar passage occurs in the Serm. 38, ad frat. in Erem. vi. App. col. 345. Legite sanct. Script. &c.; but this discourse is by many reckoned spurious.

¹ Dissuas. Pt. 2. Bk. 1. § 2. Works x. 410. See pp. 409—11.

² *Ib.* p. 411.

Matt. xxvi. 28; and "with him let the Apostle judge," proceeding to quote Rom. viii. 32.¹

And in the controversy with the Pelagians on grace and free-will, he says, "Let the Apostle John sit as judge between us."²

And in his controversy with the Donatists, he invariably appeals to Scripture as the sole Judge fit to decide which was the true Church.

"One who is weak inquires for the Church; one who is in error inquires for the Church. What do you say? The Church is on the side of Donatus. Read this to me from a Prophet, read it to me from a Psalm; recite it to me from the Law, recite it from the Gospel, recite it from an Apostle . . . I do not believe your declarations; I would not that you should believe mine. Let human writings be taken away; let the divine words be heard. Give me one word of Scripture in favour of Donatus."³

Again; "Whether we are schismatics or you, neither should I nor you be interrogated; but let Christ be asked, that he may show his own Church. Read therefore the Gospel, &c."⁴

Again; "Let us not hear, You say this, I say that; but let us hear, Thus saith the Lord. There are the Domi-

¹ Immo parvuli quomodo rei non sunt pro quibus Christus mortuus est? Ista controversia judicem quærit. Judicet ergo Christus, et cui rei mors ejus profecerit ipse dicat. Hic est inquit sanguis meus, &c. [Matt. 26. 28.] Judicet cum illo et Apostolus, &c. [Rom. viii. 32]. Id. De nupt. et concup. lib. 2. c. 33. x. 331.

² Sedeat ergo inter nos judex apostolus Johannes, et dicat nobis, Carissimi, diligamus invicem. De grat. et lib. arb. c. 18. x. 737.

³ Quærit infirmus Ecclesiam, quærit errans Ecclesiam. Tu quid dicis? Partis Donati est Ecclesia. Ego vocem Pastoris inquirō. Lege hoc mihi de Propheta, lege mihi de Psalmo, recita mihi de Lege, recita de Evangelio, recita de Apostolo . . . Non credo tuis; noli credere meis. Auferantur chartæ humanæ, sonent voces divinæ. Ede mihi unam Scripturæ vocem pro parte Donati. Serm. de Pastor. serm. 46. c. 14. v. 242. A similar passage occurs in his Enarr. in Ps. 69. § 6. iv. 715. Si ergo quæris, &c.

⁴ Utrum autem schismatici nos simus an vos, nec ego nec tu, sed Christus interrogetur, ut indicet Ecclesiam suam. Lege ergo Evangelium, &c. Id. Contra litt. Petil. lib. 2. c. 3. ix. 271.

nical books, whose authority we both acknowledge, we both yield to, we both obey; there let us seek the Church, there let us discuss the question between us Therefore let those testimonies which we mutually bring against each other, from any other quarter than the divine canonical books, be put out of sight . . . I would not have the holy Church demonstrated by human testimonies, but by the divine oracles. . . . We adhere to this Church; against those divine declarations, we admit no human cavils . . Let no one say to me, What hath Donatus said, what hath Parmenian said, or Pontius, or any of them. For we must not allow even Catholic bishops, if at any time, perchance, they are in error, to hold any opinion contrary to the canonical Scriptures of God . . . All such matters, therefore, being put out of sight, let them show their Church, if they can; not in the discourses and reports of Africans, not in the councils of their own bishops, not in the writings of any controversialists, not in fallacious signs and miracles, for even against these we are rendered by the word of the Lord prepared and cautious, but in the ordinances of the Law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the songs of the Psalms, in the words of the very Shepherd himself, in the preachings and labours of the Evangelists, that is in all the canonical authorities of the sacred books. Nor so as to collect together and rehearse those things that are spoken obscurely, or ambiguously, or figuratively, such as each can interpret as he likes, according to his own views. For such testimonies cannot be rightly understood and expounded, unless those things that are most clearly spoken, are first held by a firm faith. We ought to find the Church, as the Head of the Church, in the holy canonical Scriptures, not to inquire for it in the various reports, and opinions, and deeds, and words, and visions of men. . . . Whether they [i. e. the Donatists] hold the Church, they must show by the canonical books of the Divine Scriptures alone; for we do not say that we

must be believed because we are in the Church of Christ, because Optatus of Milevi, or Ambrose of Milan, or innumerable other bishops of our communion, commended that Church to which we belong; or because it is extolled by the councils of our colleagues, or because through the whole world, in the holy places which those of our communion frequent, such wonderful answers to prayer or cures happen . . . Whatever things of this kind take place in the Catholic Church, are therefore to be approved of, because they take place in the Catholic Church; but it is not proved to be the Catholic Church, because these things happen in it. The Lord Jesus himself, when he had risen from the dead . . . judged that his disciples were to be convinced by the testimonies of the Law, and the Prophets, and the Psalms . . . These are the proofs, these the foundations, these the supports of our cause. We read, in the Acts of the Apostles, of some who believed, that they searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so. What Scriptures, but the canonical Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets? To these have been added the Gospels, the Apostolical Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, the Apocalypse of John But if they do not choose to understand, it is sufficient for us that we adhere to that Church, which is demonstrated by such extremely clear testimonies of the holy and canonical Scriptures.”¹

Augustine did not dream of supposing that, because his adversaries might not be convinced by the testimonies brought, therefore Scripture was not a very sufficient Judge of the controversy, or that such testimonies must be doubtful and obscure. Notwithstanding their opposition, he holds those testimonies to be abundantly clear and demonstrative; as he says elsewhere, “The holy

¹ Non audiamus, Hæc dicis, hæc dico; sed audiamus, Hæc dicit Dominus. Sunt certe libri Dominici, quorum auctoritati utrique consentimus, utrique cedimus, utrique servimus; ibi quæramus Ecclesiam, ibi discutiamus causam nostram Auferantur ergo illa de medio, quæ adversus non invicem non ex divinis canonicis libris sed aliunde recitamus. . . . Nolo humanis docu-

Scripture demonstrates the Church, without any ambiguity."¹

Lastly, That he was altogether opposed to the notion of the Tractators, that consent of Fathers forms part of the rule of faith, we have already shown; but I will here add some further extracts in proof of it.

Thus, in the latter part of the Letter to Jerome, already quoted, he says, after alluding to the Fathers, "But instead of all these, nay, above all these, the Apostle Paul himself occurs to me. To him I betake myself; to him I appeal from all interpreters of his writings, who think differently," &c.²

Again; "If it is established by the *clear* authority of

mentis, sed divinis oraculis sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari. (c. 3)
 . . Nos hanc Ecclesiam tenemus, contra istas divinas voces nullas humanas
 criminationes admittimus . . . Nemo mihi dicat, O quid dixit Donatus, O
 quid dixit Parmenianus, aut Pontius, aut quilibet illorum. Quia nec catho-
 licis Episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte falluntur, ut contra canonicas
 Dei scripturas aliquid sentiant. (c. 11.) Remotis ergo omnibus
 talibus ecclesiam suam demonstrent si possunt, non in sermonibus et rumo-
 ribus Afrorum, non in conciliis episcoporum suorum, non in litteris quorum-
 libet disputatorum, non in signis et prodigiis fallacibus, quia etiam contra ista
 verbo Domini præparati et cauti redditi sumus; sed in præscripto Legis, in
 Prophetarum prædictis, in Psalmorum cantibus, in ipsius unius Pastoris vo-
 cibus, in Evangelistarum prædicationibus et laboribus, hoc est, in omnibus
 canonicis sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus. Nec ita, ut ea colligant et com-
 memorent, quæ obscure vel ambigue vel figurate dicta sunt, quæ quisque sicut
 voluerit interpretetur secundum sensum suum. Talia enim recte intelligi
 exponique non possunt, nisi prius ea quæ apertissime dicta sunt firma fide tene-
 antur. (c. 18.) Ecclesiam sicut ipsum Caput in Scripturis sanctis
 canonicis debemus agnoscere, non in variis hominum rumoribus et opinionibus
 et factis et dictis et visis inquirere . . . Utrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant, &c.
 (as above, p. 127.) Quod si nolunt intelligere, sufficit nobis quod
 eam tenemus Ecclesiam, quæ manifestissimis sanctarum et canonicarum Scrip-
 turarum testimoniis demonstratur. Id. Ep. ad Cathol. *vulg.* De unit. Ec-
 cles. cc. 3, 11, 18, 19, 22. ix. col. 340—380.

¹ Ecclesiam . . . sine ulla ambiguitate Sancta Scriptura demonstrat.
 Contra Crescon. Donat. lib. 1. c. 33. ix. 407, 8.

² Veruntamen ipse mihi pro his omnibus, immo supra hos omnes, Apostolus
 Paulus occurrit. Ad ipsum confugio; ad ipsum ab omnibus qui aliud senti-
 unt litterarum ejus tractatoribus provoco; ipsum interrogans interpello et
 requiro in eo quod scripsit ad Galatas, vidisse se Petrum, &c. Ep. ad Hieron.
 ep. 82. c. 3. ii. 199.

the divine Scriptures, those I mean that are called canonical in the Church, it is to be believed without any doubt. *But other witnesses or testimonies which are used to persuade you to believe anything, you may believe or not, just as you shall see that they have or have not any weight giving them a just claim to your confidence.*"¹

Again, after having referred to the Fathers, and quoted Ambrose, Jerome, and Athanasius in favour of the view he was advocating, against a dissentient from it, he says that he refers to them, in order that his opponent may see that the question deserved a calm and serious discussion, adding,—“For we ought not to esteem the statements of any persons, however catholic, and of whatever repute, as the canonical Scriptures, so that it may not be lawful for us, without infringing upon the honour due to those men, to blame and reject this or that in their writings, if perchance we shall have found that they have been of a different opinion to what truth requires; truth that, *by divine aid*, is understood by others, or by ourselves.”²

Again, in his controversy with the Manichees, after observing in defence of his belonging to the Catholic Church, that *the true wisdom was to be found in it*, he says, that there were also many other inducements to him to remain in it, as “the consent of various people and nations, its authority, taking its rise from miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, established by anti-

¹ Si divinarum Scripturarum, earum scilicet quæ canonicæ in Ecclesia nominantur, perspicua firmatur auctoritate, sine ulla dubitatione credendum est. Aliis vero testibus vel testimoniis, quibus aliquid credendum esse suadetur, tibi credere vel non credere liceat, quantum ea momenti ad faciendum fidem vel habere vel non habere perpenderit. Ad Paulin. ep. 147. Proem. ii. 475.

² Neque enim quorumlibet disputationes, quamvis catholicorum et laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salva honorificentia quæ illis debetur hominibus aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare atque respuere, si forte invenerimus quod aliter senserint quam veritas habet, divino adjutorio vel ab aliis intellecta vel a nobis. Talis ego sum in scriptis aliorum, tales volo esse intellectores meorum. Ad Fortunat. ep. 148. c. 4. ii. 502.

quity, the succession of priests, up to the present episcopate, from the very chair of the Apostle Peter, to whom the Lord committed his sheep to be fed after his resurrection, the very name of Catholic;" and that among the Manichees there were no inducements of this kind but only the promise of the truth; but, adds Augustine, "*if the truth is so clearly manifested that it cannot be doubted of, it is to be preferred to all those inducements to remain in the Catholic Church.*"¹

Again, speaking of the ecclesiastical writers subsequent to the Apostles, he says,—“Which kind of literature is to be read, not with a necessity of believing, but with *a liberty of judging of it* the excellence of the canonical authority of the Old and New Testament is different to the books of later writers, which being established in the times of the Apostles has, through the succession of bishops and the propagation of churches, been placed as it were on high in a seat of authority, to which every faithful and pious mind ought to be in subjection. . . . *But in the works of later writers which are contained in innumerable books, but by no means are equal to that most sacred excellence of the canonical Scriptures, even in those of them in which the same truth is found, yet the authority is far different. Therefore in them if any matters should perchance be thought to be not agreeable to the truth from their being understood differently to the sense in which they are spoken, yet the reader or hearer has in such a case an unfettered right of judgment to ap-*

¹ *Multa sunt alia quæ in ejus gremio me justissime teneant. Tenet consensio populorum atque gentium : tenet auctoritas miraculis inchoata, spe nutrita, caritate aucta, vetustate firmata ; tenet ab ipsa sede Petri Apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit usque ad præsentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum ; tenet postremo ipsum Catholicæ nomen Apud vos autem, ubi nihil horum est quod me invitet ac teneat, sola personat veritatis pollicitatio ; quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur ut in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus quibus in Catholica teneor. Contr. epist. Manich. quam voc. Fundam. c. 4. viii. 153.*

prove what shall please him or disapprove what shall offend him ; and therefore as to all things of this kind [i. e. that may be advanced by these writers], unless they may be defended either by sure grounds of reason, or from that canonical authority, so that it may be demonstrated that what is there discussed or narrated either certainly is, or might be, as there represented, he who is not satisfied with what is said, or refuses to believe it, is not blamed. But in that canonical pre-eminence of the sacred Scriptures, although only one Prophet, or Apostle, or Evangelist, is declared to have laid down any point in his writings, supposing it to have in reality the testimony of the canon in its favour, we must not doubt of its truth ; otherwise there will be no *writing by which the infirmity of human ignorance may be ruled, if the salutary authority of the canonical books is either wholly destroyed through contempt, or confounded by being extended beyond its limits* [i. e. when that authority is extended to other works.]”¹

¹ Quod genus litterarum non cum credendi necessitate, sed cum judicandi libertate legendum. Cui tamen ne intercluderetur locus, et adimeretur posteris ad quæstiones difficiles tractandas atque versandas linguæ ac stili saluberrimus labor, distincta est a posteriorum libris excellentia canonicæ auctoritatis veteris et novi Testamenti, quæ Apostolorum confirmata temporibus per successiones Episcoporum et propagationes Ecclesiarum tamquam in sede quadam sublimiter constituta est, cui serviat omnis fidelis et pius intellectus In opusculis autem posteriorum, quæ libris innumerabilibus continentur, sed nullo modo illæ sacratissimæ canonicarum Scripturarum excellentiæ cœquantur, etiam in quibuscumque eorum invenitur eadem veritas, longe tamen est impar auctoritas. Itaque in eis, si qua forte propterea dissonare putantur a vero, quia non ut dicta sunt intelliguntur, tamen liberum ibi habet lector auditorve iudicium, quo vel approbet quod placuerit, vel improbet quod offenderit ; et ideo cuncta ejusmodi, nisi vel certa ratione vel ex illa canonica auctoritate defendantur, ut demonstretur sive omnino ita esse, sive fieri potuisse quod vel disputatum ibi est, vel narratum, si cui displicuerit, aut credere noluerit, non reprehenditur. In illa vero canonica eminentia sacrarum litterarum etiamsi unus Propheta, seu Apostolus aut Evangelista aliquid in suis litteris posuisse ipsa canonis confirmatione declaratur, non licet dubitare quod verum sit : alioquin nulla erit pagina, qua humanæ imperitiæ regatur infirmitas, si librorum canonicorum saluberrima auctoritas aut contemta penitus aboletur aut interminata confunditur. Contr. Faust. lib. xi. c. 5. viii. 221, 2.

I ask the impartial reader, Is it possible that Augustine could have spoken thus, if he had held that the consent of these writers formed part,—and through the obscurity of Scripture a *necessary* part,—of the rule of faith?

Again, when the Donatists objected to him the statements of Cyprian, and the Council held under him, he says,—“ But who is ignorant that the holy canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament is limited to certain bounds, and is so far above all the later writings of bishops, that of it it cannot be doubted or disputed whether it is true or right, whatsoever shall appear to be written in it; but that *as to the writings of bishops which either have been written or are being written since the confirmation of the canon, that they may be found fault with*, both by the wiser discourse of any one more skilful in the matter, and by the weightier authority and more learned wisdom of other bishops, and by councils; and that local and provincial councils yield without any doubt to the authority of those plenary councils that are assembled together from the whole Christian world; AND THAT AS TO THOSE VERY ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS, THE FORMER ARE OFTEN CORRECTED BY LATER, when experience opens what was closed, and brings to light that which was hidden, without any swellings of sacrilegious pride, without any exaltation of the neck of arrogance, without any envious contentions, with holy humility, with catholic peace, with Christian charity.”¹

¹ Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonicam, tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus episcoporum litteris ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit, utrum verum vel utrum rectum sit, quidquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit, episcoporum autem litteras quæ post confirmatum canonem vel scriptæ sunt vel scribuntur, et per sermonem forte sapientiores cujuslibet in ea re peritioris, et per aliorum episcoporum graviores auctoritatem doctioresque prudentiam, et per concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est; et ipsa concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati quæ fiunt ex universo orbe Christiano sine ullis ambagibus cedere; ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat et cognoscitur quod latebat, sine ullo typho sacrilegæ superbæ, sine ulla inflata cervice arrogantia, sine ulla contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum caritate Christiana. De bapt. contr. Donat. lib. ii. c. 3. ix. 98.

Lastly, in reply to the Pelagians, on the important doctrine of original sin, after having proved his view of the point in question from the holy Scriptures, he says,—“But what shall I say of those interpreters of the divine Scriptures who have flourished in the catholic church, how they have not attempted to turn these testimonies to other senses, since they stood firm in the antient and sound faith, and were not moved by novel error. *If I should wish to collect them, and make use of their testimonies, it will be both too long a task, AND I SHALL PERHAPS SEEM TO HAVE RELIED LESS THAN I OUGHT UPON THE CANONICAL AUTHORITIES, FROM WHICH WE OUGHT NOT TO ALLOW OUR ATTENTION TO BE WITHDRAWN.*”¹

So far is he from giving to those writers the place demanded for them by the Tractators.

Before I pass on, I have only to remark, that as it respects *matters of faith*, I know of no testimonies that can be produced from Augustine that even semblably support the views of our opponents. The reader will consider whether the passages we have already adduced do not forbid the supposition that any real support for their views could be found in him. His sentiments as it respects the Rule of practice we shall consider hereafter.

CHRYSTOM (fl. a. 398.)

From Augustine let us pass on to the equally celebrated Chrysostom. “Let us, I beseech you,” says Chrysostom, “shut our ears against all such persons, and follow closely the Rule (or Canon) of the Holy Scripture.”²

¹ Quid autem dicam de ipsis divinarum Scripturarum tractatoribus qui in catholica Ecclesia floruerunt, quomodo hæc non in alios sensus conati sunt vertere, quoniam stabiles erant in antiquissima et robustissima fide, non autem novitio movebantur errore. Quos si colligere et eorum testimoniis uti velim, et nimis longum erit, et de canonicis auctoritatibus, a quibus non debemus averti, minus fortasse videbor præsumsisse quam debui. De nupt. et concup. lib. ii. c. 29. x. 328.

² Παρακαλῶ, πᾶσι τοῖς τοιοῦτοις τὰς ἀκοὰς ἀποτειχισάωτες, τῷ κανόνι τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς κατακολουθήσωμεν. CHRYSOSTOMI in Genes. hom. xiii. § 3. tom. iv. p. 103. ed. Bened. Paris. 1718 et seq.

Again, anticipating the objection of a Pagan to become a Christian, on account of the multitude of sects among Christians, he says,—“A Pagan comes and says, ‘I desire to be a Christian, but I know not to whom to attach myself. There is much contention and division among you, and much confusion. What doctrine shall I choose? Which shall I prefer? Each one says, I speak the truth. Whom am I to believe, having no knowledge at all in the Scriptures? And they both produce the same [testimony].’ This, at least, is altogether in our favour. For if we said that you must believe our reasonings, you might with reason be troubled; but if we say *that you must believe the Scriptures, and they are simple and true, it is easy for you to judge*. If any one receives these, he is a Christian; if any one opposes them, he is far from the pale of Christianity. What, therefore, if he should come and say that the Scripture says this or that, but thou speakest differently; and ye have interpreted them in quite another way, distorting their meaning. *Tell me, then, have you neither understanding nor judgment?* ‘And how could I,’ he says, ‘not knowing how to judge your matters? I desire to be a scholar; but you make me already a master.’ If he should say this, what shall we answer?—how shall we persuade him? LET US ASK HIM IF ALL THIS IS NOT A MERE EXCUSE AND PRETENCE.” And then, having added some further observations on the marks by which he might discern the true Church, he adds,—“But this is an excuse and pretence.”¹

¹ Ερχεται Ἕλλην, καὶ λέγει, ὅτι βουλομαι γενεσθαι Χριστιανός· ἀλλ’ οὐκ οἶδα τίνι προσθῶμαι· μαχὴ παρ’ ὑμῖν πολλὴ καὶ στάσις· πολὺς θορυβὸς· ποίον ἔλομαι δόγμα; τί αἰρήσομαι; ἕκαστος λέγει, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀληθεύω· τίνι πεισθῶ, μὴδὲν ὧς εἰδὼς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς; κακείνοι το αὐτο προβαλλονται· πανγὰρ τοῦτο ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ λογισμοῖς ἐλεγόμεν πειθεσθαι, εἰκότως ἐθορυβῶν· εἰ δὲ ταῖς γραφαῖς λεγόμεν πιστεῦν, αὐταὶ δὲ ἅπλαι καὶ ἀληθεῖς, εὐκόλῳ σοι το κρίνόμενον· εἰ τις ἐκείναις συμφωνεῖ, οὗτος Χριστιανός· εἰ τις μαχεταί, οὗτος πορρῶ τοῦ κανόνος τοῦτου. Τί οὖν ἀν ἐκεῖνος ἐλθὼν εἰπῇ, τοῦτο ἐχειν τὴν γραφὴν, σὺ δὲ ἕτερον λέγῃς, καὶ ἄλλως παρεξηγήσῃς τὰς γραφὰς τὰς διανοίας αὐτῶν ἔλκοντες; σὺ οὖν, εἶπε μοι, νουν οὐκ ἔχεις, οὐδὲ κρίσιν; καὶ πῶς ἀν δυναιμην, φῃσι, μὴδὲ εἰδὼς κρίνειν τὰ ἡμετέρα; μαθητὴς βουλομαι γενεσθαι· σὺ δὲ με ἤδη διδασκαλὸν

Again, commenting on 2 Tim. v. 16, 17. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," he says,—
 "For doctrine. If there is anything which it behoves us to learn or be ignorant of, thence we shall know it. If it behoves us to reprove false doctrine, thence also we shall know it. If we need to be corrected and taught wisdom. For exhortation, for comfort, for correction, he says. That is if anything is deficient, and needs to be added. That the man of God may be perfect. He says that the exhortations of Scripture were given for this purpose; that the man of God may be perfect Instead of me, he says, you have the Scriptures. *If you are desirous of learning anything, you will be able to do so from them.* And if he wrote these things to Timothy, who was full of the Holy Spirit, how much more to us? Thoroughly furnished to all good works. Not simply a partaker, he says, but *thoroughly and accurately furnished.*"¹

And in his commentary on the fifth Psalm, he speaks of the Scriptures as Christ's Will, giving an account of the heavenly inheritance, and how it is to be obtained, observing that "when we shall have arrived at perfect manhood, and the measure of our age, and passed to that life which is without change, he will then put us in possession of that inheritance. But in the mean time he has made a Will and left us *the Scriptures, and told us what to do, in*

ποιεις' αν ταυτα λεγη, τι, φησιν, αποκρινομεθα; πως αυτον πεισομεν; ερωτησωμεν, ει μη σκηψις ταυτα και προφασις αλλα σκηψις τουτο και προφασις. ID. In Act. Apost. hom. 33. § 4. ix. 258, 9.

¹ Προς διδασκαλιαν' ει τι μαθειν, ει τι αγνοησαι χρη, εκειθεν εισομεθα' ει ελεγξαι τα ψευδη, και τουτο εκειθεν' ει επανορθωθηναι και σωφρονισθηναι προς παρακλησιν, προς παραμυθιαν, φησι, προς επανορθωσιν' τουτεστι, ει τι λειπει, και χρη προστεθηναι' ινα αρτιος η ο του Θεου ανθρωπος' δια τουτο φησι, γεγονεν η των γραφωv παρακλησις, ινα αρτιος η ο του Θεου ανθρωπος αντ' εμου, φησι, τας γραφας εχεις' ει τι βουλει μαθειν, εκειθεν δυναση' ει δε Τιμοθεω ταυτα εγραφε τω πνευματος εμπεπλησμενω, ποσω μυλλον ημιν; προς παν εργον αγαθον εζηρτ σεμενος' ουχ απλως μετεχων, φησιν, αλλα μετ' ακριβειας εξηρτισμενος. ID. In 2 Tim. v. 16, 17. hom. 9. § 1. xi. 714, 15.

order to obtain the inheritance; so that we may not fail to obtain it, nor be disinherited.”¹

Other passages may be found in works going under the name of Chrysostom, to the same effect; but I shall not here dwell upon them, as they are of doubtful genuineness.²

Moreover, he bears witness to the completeness and perfection of Scripture as the Rule of faith. For he says that we have in the Scriptures “*an exact measure, and index, and rule of all things*;” adding, “Wherefore I exhort and beseech all of you that, giving up all consideration as to what this or that person thinks concerning these things, you would consult the Scriptures respecting all these things; and having learnt the true riches, let us follow after these things, that we may obtain eternal blessings.”³

And by “rule,” he means that which receives neither addition nor diminution, as far as it is a rule; for he tells us that “a rule receives neither addition nor diminution, otherwise it ceases to be a rule.”⁴

Again, he says,—“*Look not for another master; thou hast the oracles of God; no one teaches thee like them . . . Ignorance of the Scriptures is the cause of all evils.*”⁵

¹ Επειδαν εις ανδρα τελειον και μετρον ηλικιας κατανησωμεν, και προς τον ακηρατον μεταστωμεν βιον, τοτε ημιν εγχειριζει τον κληρον εκεινον. Τωσ δε διεθετο, και τα γραμματα ημιν κατελιπε, και τινα πραττοντες επιτευξομεθα της κληρονομιας ειπεν, ωστε μη εκπεσειν, μηδε αποκληρονομους γενεσθαι. Id. Expos. in Ps. 5. § 1. v. 29.

² See Homil. de Spir. S. § 10. iii. 808. This homily is considered by Photius a genuine work of Chrysostom; and by Savile the production of some learned contemporary of Chrysostom. See also Homil. in Ps. 95. *prope fin.* v. 636. This homily, however, is probably spurious.

³ Πως γαρ ουκ ατοπον . . . υπερ πραγματων ψηφιζομενους, απλως ταις ετερων παρασυρεσθαι δοξαις και ταυτα ακριβη ζυγον απαντων εχοντας, και γνωμονα και κανονα, των θειων νομων την αποφασιν; διο παρακαλω και δεομαι παντων υμων, αφερτες τι τω δεινι και τω δεινι δοκει περι τουτων, παρα των γραφων ταυτα απαντι πυνθανεσθε, και τον αληθη πλουτον μαθοντες, τουτων διακωμεν, ινα και των αιωνιων επιτυχωμεν αγαθων. Id. In 2 Cor. hom. 13. *fin.* x. 537.

⁴ Ο Κανων ουτε προσθεσιν ουτε αφαιρεσιν δεχεται, επει το κανων εινα απολυσι. Id. In Phil. hom. 12. xi. 293.

⁵ Μηδε περιμεινης ετερον διδασκαλον εχεις τα λογια του Θεου ουδεις σε διδασκει ως εκεινα . . . τουτο παντων αιτιον των κακων, το μη ειδεναι τας γραφας. Id. In Coloss. hom. 9. § 1. xi. 391.

And in a work, which, if it be not Chrysostom's, has been so spoken of by Romanists themselves, as to make it require no defence here, as a work of equal value as if it was; I mean the "Imperfect work on Matthew;"¹ it is said, on the words "All things are ready, come unto the marriage,"—"Whatever is requisite for salvation, that is all fully to be found in the Scriptures . . . In this feast there is nothing less than what is necessary to the salvation of men."²

I add below a reference to some other passages, which the reader may consult on this point.³

And with respect to the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, he distinctly speaks of it as being clearly and fully delivered in Scripture.⁴

So clear, indeed, is his testimony on this whole subject, that even the Romanist Du Pin says,—“St Chrysostom looks upon the Holy Scripture *as the ground and rule of all the truths of religion.*”⁵

Further, Chrysostom distinctly places Scripture before us as our proper guide to direct us in controversies of faith.

¹ Thus Erasmus says, that though not Chrysostom's, it was the work “*hominis eruditi et facundi et in divinis literis sic exercitati ut mea quidem sententia hac in parte non cedat Chrysostomo.*” Bellarmine says, “*credibile esse authorem fuisse catholicum,*” and calls it a work “*doctum et minime spernendum.*” (De Script. Eccles. ad ann. 398.) Sixtus Senensis says that it was “*tot sæculis communi Ecclesiæ assensu comprobatum,*” and adduces many reasons for supposing it to be a genuine work of Chrysostom; to which opinion he himself is evidently inclined; though he says that the opinions of critics are diverse on the subject. (See his Bibl. Sanct.) The two latter, however, hold it to have been interpolated by heretics.

² Quidquid quæritur ad salutem, totum jam adimpletum est in Scripturis. . . . Nihil minus est in hoc convivio quam quod necessarium habet salus humana. Opus Imperf. in Matth. hom. 41. vi. clxxiv. App.

³ See Comment in Act. hom. 29. § 4. ix. 231. Comment. in Heb. hom. 8. § 4. xii. 89. Also in the homily De Spir. S., written, as Savile supposes, by some learned contemporary of Chrysostom, it is said,—*ἀ οὐ γεγραπται, οὐ δεῖ φρονεῖν.* Tom. iii. p. 798. And in the homily De Pseudo-Prophetis, which, however, the Benedictines reckon spurious, *Οὐδεν εἰλεπεν οὐδε παρεσιωπησε των συμφεροντων ἡμιν ἡ θεια γραφη.* viii. 73. App.

⁴ See his Homil. de Consubstant. § 2. Tom. i. pp. 502, 3.

⁵ Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 320. Dublin edit.

Thus, commenting on John x. 1, "He that entereth not by *the door* into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber;" he says, "Observe the marks of the thief; first, that he enters not with confidence; secondly, that he enters not by *the Scriptures*,—for this is the meaning of not entering by *the door*. And he here alludes to both those who were before him, and those who were to come after him; both antichrist and false Christs; both Judas and Theudas, and all others of the same kind. But he *very properly called the Scriptures the door, for they lead us to God, and open to us the knowledge of divine things; they make the sheep; they guard them, and suffer not the wolves privily to enter in. For as a secure door, so they prevent the entrance of heretics*, affording us a place of safety for all things we could desire, and not suffering us to wander; and if we do not open it, we shall not be easily taken captive by our enemies. *By it we shall know in all cases both those that are sheep, and those that are not.*"¹

And lastly, the reader will not fail to recollect the remarkable passage quoted in a previous page² from the "Imperfect work on Matthew," the author of which, speaking of the times of Antichrist, says that "at that time there can be no proof of true Christianity, nor any other refuge for Christians wishing to know the true faith but the divine Scriptures," and no way "to ascertain which is the true Church of Christ, but only through the Scriptures;" because those who followed Antichrist,

¹ 'Ορα τα δειγματα του ληστου' πρωτον, οτι ου παρρησια εισερχεται' δευτερον, οτι ου κατα τας γραφας, τουτο γαρ εστι το μη δια της θυρας' ενταυθα δε και τους προ αυτου αιγιττεται, και τους μετ' αυτον εσομενους' τον τε αντιχριστον και τους ψευδοχριστους' τον τε Ιουδαν και Θεудαν, και ει τινες ετεροι τοιουτοι γεγονασιν. Εικοτως δε θυραν τας γραφας εκαλεσεν' αυται γαρ ημας προσαγουσι τω Θεω, και την θεογνωσιαν ανοιγουσιν' αυται προβατα ποιουσιν' αυται φυλαττουσι, και τους λυκους ουκ αφιασιν επεισελθειν. Καθαπερ γαρ τις θυρα ασφαλης, οτως αποκλειει τοις αιρετικοις την εισοδον, εν ασφαλεια καθιστωσα ημας περι ων αν βουλωμεθα παντων, και ουκ εωσα πλανασθαι' καν μη παραλυσωμεν αυτην, ουκ εσομεθα ευχειρωτοι τοις εχθροις. Δια ταυτης και τους ποιμενας και τους ου ποιμενας εισομεθα απαντας. Id. In Johann. hom. 59. (al. 58.) § 2. viii. 346.

² See pp. 128, 9 above.

would have all the external appearances of the Christian Church as to Churches, the Scriptures, bishops, &c. ; and that "the Lord, knowing that such a confusion of things would take place in the last days, commands, on that account, that the Christians who are in Christianity, and desirous of availing themselves of the strength of the true faith, should betake themselves to nothing else but the Scriptures. Otherwise if they shall look to other things, they shall stumble and perish, not understanding which is the true Church. And, through this, they shall fall upon the abomination of desolation, which standeth in the holy places of the Church."¹

Antichrist, let us observe, would use the same divine Scriptures ; but, notwithstanding that, the only safe guide to those who wished to know the true faith and the true Church, would be *those very Scriptures* ; so little did he think that, because Antichrist perverted and mis-used them, therefore they were not fit and sufficient to sit as judge upon his claims and errors, and decide the controversy between truth and falsehood.

What, then, does Bellarmine, who acknowledges the value of the book itself, say to this ? Why, forsooth, all these remarks are the interpolation of some Arian heretic ! Upon which Bishop Taylor observes, "Bellarmine very learnedly says (De V. D. iv. 11.) that these words were put into this book by the Arians, but because he offers at no pretence of reason for any such interpolation, and it being without cause to suspect it, though the author of it had been an Arian, *because the Arians were never noted to differ from the Church in the point of the Scripture's sufficiency*, I look upon this as a pitiful shift of a man that resolved to say anything rather than confess his error."²

And in the same way Sixtus Senensis would get rid of the passage previously quoted from this work,³ as well as

¹ Ib.

² Dissuas. from Popery, Pt. 2. Works, vol. x. p. 405. And see his Rule of Conscience, bk. 2. c. 3. rule 14. Works, xiii. 103, 4. And Bp. Morton's Cath. App. pp. 313, 14.

³ See p. 439 above.

others. But, says Bishop Taylor, "When they cannot show, by any probable argument, that any heretics have interpolated these words, and that these are *so agreeing to other words of St. Chrysostom, spoken in his unquestioned works*, he shows himself and his party greatly pinched; and for no other reason rejects the words, but because they make against him; which is a plain self-conviction and self-condemnation."¹

There are two passages, however, connected with this subject, in the works of Chrysostom, which require explanation.

The first is in his Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, where, explaining the words, "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have received, whether by word or our epistle" (ii. 15.), he says,—“Hence it is evident that they [the Apostles] did not deliver all things by letter, but many things also orally; but both the one and the other are equally worthy of belief; let us, then, esteem also the tradition of the Church to be worthy of belief; it is a tradition; seek no further.”²

But to know the mind of Chrysostom, this passage must be compared with others in him upon the same subject; and when we consider it in connexion with those which we have quoted above, it seems evident that these oral traditions, to which Chrysostom refers, were not points of faith, but rites and customs of the Church; for, as to the former, he distinctly sends us to Scripture as our rule, and a perfect rule. As it respects the latter, I willingly admit that he and other Fathers of the Church held that many of the rites and customs of the Church, not mentioned in Scripture, might be considered as having been derived from Apostolical ordinance or sanc-

¹ Works, x. 405.

² Εντευθεν δηλον ότι ου παντα δι' επιστολης παρεδιδοσαν, αλλα πολλα και αγραφως· ὁμοιως δε κακεινα και ταυτα εστιν αξιοπιστα· ὥστε και την παραδοσιν της Εκκλησιας αξιοπιστον ἡγωμεθα· παραδοσις εστι, μηδεν πλεον ζητει. ID. In 2 Thess. ii. 15. hom. 4. xi. 532.

tion; and that as it concerned those which *the Church* used and celebrated under that name, it was desirable and proper for individuals to rest satisfied, and not trouble the Church by curious inquiries into the matter; a judgment which, when restrained within its proper bounds, has good grounds to rest upon.

And thus speaks the Tractators' own witness, Bishop Morton, on the passage,—“If by these words, ‘as worthy of credit,’ be meant the traditions ceremonial, in this sense we must believe, certainly, that the ceremonies ordained by the Apostles were just and lawful, albeit (as even our adversaries do teach) alterable: so this sentence doth not differ from the profession of Protestants. But if the Romanists will have it understood of doctrinal points of faith, which are absolutely necessary unto salvation, as though some such article were not recorded in Scriptures, then was it not unjustly to be censured a speech unfitting the golden mouth of Chrysostome; because so S. Chrysostome should contradict himself in many places, not only of his supposed works, as hath been showed, in so plain sort justifying our defence of *only Scripture*, that their Church hath, therefore, in their new editions of Chrysostome, wiped that sentence out, [alluding to the *Opus Imp.* in *Matth.*]; but also in his unquestionable works, yea, even in his Homily next going before the objected testimony, where, exhorting all men to be exercised in reading the Scriptures, ‘All things,’ saith he, ‘which are necessary, are manifest’ . . . [he proceeds to quote the Exposition on Ps. 95, which I omit as doubtful] . . . For the which cause he calleth the sacred Scriptures (In 2 Cor. hom. 13.) ‘A most exact balance, square, and rule of divine laws.’ Wherein Chrysostome is irreconcilably contrary unto the Romanists, who, for the defence of unwritten traditions, do esteem of Scripture, not as of a *most exact*, but only as of a *part of a rule of faith*.”¹

The other passage occurs in his Commentary on the

¹ Morton's Cath. App. ii, 25. 4. p. 315.

Epistle to the Philippians, and stands thus,—“These things were not vainly instituted by the Apostles, namely, that at the celebration of the tremendous mysteries [i. e. the Eucharist] a remembrance should be made of the departed.”¹

But here the tradition spoken of is clearly a mere custom, namely, that a *remembrance* should be made of the departed at the celebration of the Eucharist; and such a remembrance may be made (as it is in our own service) without its involving any doctrine of any kind whatsoever; and the words with which Chrysostom follows up the remark, namely, “they knew that much gain and much profit would hence accrue to them,”² contain merely an expression of Chrysostom’s own sentiments.

I will only add, that if our opponents wish to avail themselves of this last remark, as showing that Chrysostom favoured their views in another point, they had better first read the whole homily; for they will find that he not only advocates our praying for the faithful, but the dead generally, including expressly those who have died impenitent and unbelievers, to whom he thinks that our prayers may bring some benefit.³

Before I pass on, however, I must notice a passage quoted by the author of Tract 34 from the works of Chrysostom, and which forms another striking instance how little the Tractators’ extracts from the Fathers are to be depended upon. The passage, as given by the Tractator, is this, “He who is duly strengthened in faith, does not go so far as to require reason and cause for what is enjoined, but is satisfied with the *tradition* alone.” The *italics* are the Tractators. This passage he quotes as his motto; and then proceeds, in his Tract, to inculcate the

¹ Ουκ εικη ταυτα ενομοθετηθη ὑπο των αποστολων, το επι των φρ.κτων μυστηριων μνημην γινεσθαι των απελθοντων. Ib. In Phil. i. 24. Hom. 3. xi. 217.

² Ισασιν αυτοις πολυ κερδος γινομενον, πολλην την ωφελειαν. Ib.

³ Κλαιωμεν ουν τουτους, βοηθωμεν αυτοις κατα δυναμιν, επινοησωμεν αυτοις τινα βοηθειαν, μικραν μεν, βοηθειν δε ὁμως δυναμενην. Ib. And see the whole of § 4. pp. 216—18.

necessity of observing certain rites and customs of the early Church as Apostolical traditions. *Now this is a direct misapplication of the words of Chrysostom, which no reader, who had attended to the context, could have made.* The words of Chrysostom are these. They are on those words of the Apostle, “I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you.” (1 Cor. xi. 2.) And he says,—“Therefore he then delivered many things not in writing, which also he frequently elsewhere states; but he then *delivered them only*, but now he *gives the reason*. For thus he rendered these his hearers more confident, and put down the haughtiness of those who opposed them. He proceeds not to say, ye have obeyed, but others have disobeyed; but indirectly, through the instruction he gives, he hints this in what follows, speaking thus,—‘I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God.’ Here the *reason* is given. And he gives this, that he may make the weaker more attentive. The faithful and confirmed [disciple] therefore, as is right, needs neither *reason* nor *cause* for the things that may be commanded, but is satisfied with the *delivery* alone. But the weak, when he knows also the *cause*, then holds what was said with greater earnestness, and obeys with greater alacrity.”¹

I need not add one word to show the reader how completely the passage quoted by the Tractator has been perverted by him from its true meaning.

¹ Αρα και αγραφως πολλα παρεδιδου τοτε, ο και αλλαχου πολλαχου δηλοι. Αλλα τοτε μεν παρεδωκε μονον, νυν δε και αιτιολογιαν τιθησιν. Ουτω γαρ και τουτους ισχυροτερους εποικει τους ακουοντας, και εκεινων κατεσπα το φυσημα των εναντιουμενων. Ειτα ου λεγει οτι υμεις μεν υπηκουσατε, ετεροι δε παρηκουσαν, αλλα ανυποπτως εκ της διδασκαλιας αυτο αινιττεται δια των εξης, ουτω λεγων· θελω δε υμας ειδεναι, κ. τ. λ. ‘Η μεν αιτιολογια αυτη. Τιθησι δε αυτην, τους ασθενεστερους προσεκτικωτερους ποιων. ‘Ο μεν ουν πιστος, ως χρη, και ερρωμενος ουδε δειται λογου ουδε αιτιας, υπερ ων αν επιταχθη, αλλ’ αρκειται τη παραδοσει μονη. ‘Ο δε ασθενεστερος, οταν και την αιτιαν μαθη, τοτε και μετα πλειονος της σπουδης κατεχει το λεχθεν, και μετα πολλης υπακουει της προθυμιας. In 1 Cor. hom. 26. § 1. x. 228, 9.

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA (fl. a. 412.)

I proceed to Cyril of Alexandria.

“That which the divine Scripture hath not spoken, how,” he asks, “shall we receive it and reckon it among verities?”¹

Again, commenting on 1 Cor. i. 21. he says,—“By the foolishness of preaching, he means the plainness of the phraseology of the inspired Scripture. Therefore leaving off labouring in vain and reaping no fruit, and spending your labours upon things that are unprofitable, hear me rather, and eat that which is good, namely, through *the Evangelical proclamations*, in which, saith he, your soul would abundantly delight, and be nourished. *There* is the true knowledge of God as he is, and instruction as to all virtue and propriety of conduct, becoming saints; and wisdom, such as with wonderful exactness rightly discerns everything that ought to be done, and perfectly fits the mind for activity in good works.”²

Again; “We teach in the Churches, *adducing the doctrines taught in the inspired Scripture, bringing the Evangelical and Apostolical word* before our hearers as a kind of heavenly food.”³

Again, in his Third Dialogue respecting the Holy Trinity, one of the speakers observes, “To whom that is wise

¹ Ὁ γὰρ οὐκ εἰρηκεν ἡ θεία γραφή, τίνα δὴ τρόπον παραδεξομεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἐχούσι καταλογιζομεθα; CYRILL. ALEX. Glaphyr. in Genes. lib. ii. p. 29. Op. ed. Aubert. tom. i.

² Μωριαν δὲ τοῦ κηρυγματος τὴν κοινότητα τῆς λέξεως τῆς ἐνοουσης τῇ θεο-πνευστῷ γραφῇ φησιν. Αἰφέντες οὖν το εἰκη πονεῖν, καὶ ἀκαρτίαν συλλεγεῖν, καὶ δαπανᾷν ἀνεχεσθαὶ πόνους ἐπ’ ἀνωφελεσι πράγμασι, μᾶλλον ἀκουσατέ μου, καὶ φαγεσθε ἀγαθὰ, τὰ διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν κηρυγμάτων δηλονότι, οἷς δὴ καὶ περιτῶς, φησιν, ἐντρυφήσειεν ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν· ἐκεῖ γῶσις ἀληθῆς τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀπάσης, καὶ ἁγιοπρεποῦς εὐκοσμίας μαθήμα, καὶ συνεσις θαυμαστῶς ἑκάστῃ τῶν πρακτῶν ὁρθῶς διακρινόντα, [διακρινούσα] καὶ τεχνίτην εἰς ἀγαθοῦργίαν ἀποτελούσα τὸν νοῦν, κ. τ. λ. Comment. in Is. lib. v. tom. ii. Op. tom. ii. p. 774.

³ Διδασκομεν γὰρ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις τὰ διὰ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς παρακομιζόντες δόγματα, καὶ ὥσπερ τίνα τροφὴν πνευματικὴν τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν τε καὶ ἀποστολικὸν παρὰτιθέντες λόγον. Comment. in Johann. Ev. lib. vi. Op. tom. iv. p. 638.

is it not evident that you, O my friend, will adduce vain words to us, and heap up a cold and useless mass of notions, unless you should prove to us that the volumes of the sacred writers agree with what you have spoken? For we shall not follow those who desire and are accustomed to speak from their own imaginations alone, but those who speak *from the mouth of the Lord, according to that which is written;*" to which the other speaker replies, "*You speak rightly.* Therefore the divine David declared, &c."¹

And in the next Dialogue, the same speaker remarks,—"It is best not to love to be moved by the bold assertions of others, since they carry us away to incorrect views, but to make *the words of the inspired writers the correct and exact rule of faith.* For it is but right that we should assent to them rather than others, and say, 'It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaks in you;'" to which the other replies, "You have spoken most correctly."²

¹ A. Και τινι των ευφρονουντων ασυμφανες, ὡς εικαιους ἦμιν, ω φιλοτης, επαντλησεις λογους, ψυχραν δε και αχρηστον εννοιων επισωρευσεις πληθυν, ει μη συνηχουσας οἷς εφης τας των ἁγιων ἡμιν επιδειξαι συγγραφας; ἔψομεθα γαρ ουχι τοις εθελουσι τε και ειωθοσι τα απο μονης της σφῶν αυτων ερευγεσθαι διανοιας, αλλα τοις λαλουσιν απο στοματος Κυριου, κατα το γεγραμμενον. B. Ευ λεγεις ουκουν ὁ μεν θειος, φησιν, ὑμνησε Δαβιδ, κ. τ. λ. De S. Trin. Dial. 3. tom. v. P. 1. p. 477. The phrase των ἁγιων is frequently used by Cyril for the inspired writers. As,—H ου διεπυθου των ἁγιων ἡμιν ανακεκραγοτων περι Θεου, πη μεν, ὅτι εἷς εστιν ὁ νομοθετης και κριτης, πη δε αυ, ὁ μονος εχων αθανασιαν; Dial. 3. Ib. p. 476. And again; B. Αρα αν εχοις ειπειν εκ των ἱερων γραμματων τις αν γενοιτο των τοιoutων ἢ πιστις; A. Και τοι βραχυς κοιμηθῃ δαπανηθησεται πονος, συναγειροντι σοι τας των ἁγιων φωνας. Εφεσιouis μεν γαρ επιστελλων ὁ Παυλος, κ. τ. λ. Dial. 6. Ib. p. 603. Another instance occurs in the passage next but one to this below. And so when drawing a distinction between the Old and New Testament writers, he calls the former των αρχαιοτερων ἁγιων. Dial. 7. Ib. p. 642. The phrase might perhaps be taken from 2 Pet. i. 21.

² A. Αριστον ουν, ω Ερμεια, το μη ταις ἑτερον αθυροστομιας αναπτοεισθαι φιλειν, επεῖτα προς νουν ἡμας τον αδοκιμον αποφερουσι, πιστεως δε κανονα τον ευθυτενη τε και αδιαστροφον, τους των θεηγορων ποιεισθαι λογους· προποι γαρ αν, ουχ ἑτεροις μαλλον ἡμας, η εκεινοις αυτοις επικροτειν τε και λεγειν, ουχ ὑμεις εστε οἱ λαλουντες, αλλα το πνευμα του Πατρος ὑμων το λαλουν εν ὑμιν. B. Ορθοτατα εφης. De S. Trin. Dial. 4. Ib. p. 504. The phrase των θεηγορων is another phrase not unfrequently used by Cyril for the inspired writers. As for instance,—“A. Προσαναπυθεσθαι δε σου βουλοιμην αν τοδε, ποτερα τας των θεηγο-

And his references to Scripture and Scripture only, as the ground for faith in the doctrines he advanced, are constant.¹

Again ; he says,—“ And first of all we may say to these visionaries, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the great mystery of godliness, that is, Christ, who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. But I think that our opponents ought either to pass condemnation upon those of old, and accuse the teachers of the world, to whom Christ himself said, ‘ Go and teach all nations,’ of bearing false witness ; or if they shrink from doing this, to embrace the orthodox doctrine respecting Christ, and having bid farewell to their ignorant conceits, *to hold firmly to the sacred Scriptures, and following the right path of the sacred writers, go straight to the truth itself.*”²

Again ; “ But if, to persons in such a state of mind, it is

ρων φωνας . . . ποιησονται παρουνδεν ; B. Αψευδειν ερουσιν, οιμαι που. A. Γραφει τοινυν ο ιερωτατος τε και παναριστος Παυλος, κ. τ. λ. Dial. 5. p. 546. And again with των αγιων in the following passage—A. Και μην ισθι τοι πεφρονηκως ουχ ετερον τι, παρα το τοις αγιοις και θεηγοροις δοκουν, οι τον περι τουτων ημιν παρεδωσαν τε και διεσαφησαν λογον. ‘Ο μεν γαρ θεσπεσιος Ιωαννης. . . . Παυλος δε . . . φησιν, κ. τ. λ. De S. Trin. Dial. 4. Ib. p. 519.

¹ A. Ιτεον δη ουν επ’ αυτην η ταχος την αγιαν γραφην, κ. τ. λ. Dial. 2. Ib. p. 450. Again ;—B. Και τις αν γενοιτο τουτων η πιστις ; A. Το γραμμα το ιερον, η θεοπνευστος γραφη σαφως και ηκριβωμενως ενουσα Θεω το Πνευμα αυτου. Dial. 7. p. 641. And again ;—A. Φερε την θειαν τε και ιεραν πολυπραγμουνοντες γραφην, καταβρησωμεν απ’ αυτης το ζητουμενον. Quod unus sit Christus Dialog. tom. v. P. 1. p. 731.

² Φερε λεγωμεν, και προ γε των αλλων τοις δοκηταις πλανασθε μη ειδοτες τας γραφας, μητε μην το μεγα της ευσεβειας μυστηριον, τουτεστι Χριστον, ος εφανερωθη εν σαρκι . . . (1 Tim. iii. 16.) Δειν δε οιμαι τους δι’ ενωτιας η ψηφον επαγειν την αισχω τοις παλαι, και ψευδηγορους αποκαλειν τους της οικουμενης μυσταγωγους, οis αυτος εφη Χριστος πορευθεντες μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη, η ειπερ τουτο καταπεφρικασι δραν, ορθα μεν ελεσθαι φρονειν τα επι Χριστω φρασαντας δε το ερρωσθαι δειν ταις σφων αυτων αμυθiais, απριξ μεν εχεσθαι των ιερων γραμματων την δε απλανη των αγιων διαγοντας τριβον, επ’ αυτην ιεναι την αληθειαν. De recta fide ad Theodos. Op. tom. v. P. 2. p. 6. This passage, with much more of the context, is also to be found word for word in his De incarn. Unigen. Dial. tom. v. P. 1. pp. 680, 1.

necessary to apply the rein, would it not be most absurd to be silent, and not to instil into your pious ears the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, as a sweet and life-giving fountain, which God long ago promised us; saying, by the voice of Isaiah, ‘Ye shall draw water with joy out of the wells of salvation.’ But ‘*the wells of salvation,*’ we interpret as meaning *the holy prophets, evangelists, and apostles*, who pour upon the world the supernal, and heavenly, and salutary word; the Holy Spirit supplying it to them; and thus fill with joy the whole world. Come, therefore, let us apply our mind to those things that lie in the depths of that spiritual teaching, and *thence draw the discovery of the truth.*”¹ And further on in the same treatise; “Since it is *necessary that we should follow the sacred Scriptures, in nothing going beyond what they sanction*, let us proceed to mention how God the Father is said to crown the Son with glory.”²

Again, in his Letter to Eupotius, he says,—“It behoved him, being well versed in the inspired Scriptures, if it was altogether his purpose to enter into a discussion with us respecting the divine mysteries, *to refer only to the sacred Scriptures*; and thus to compose his exposition in a spirit of piety, and not bring forward against us old and putid fables.”³

¹ Εἰ δὲ καὶ τοῖς οὕτως ἐχούσι φρενὸς προσβαλλεῖν ἀναγκαῖον, πῶς οὐκ ἂν γενοιτο τῶν ἀγὰν σφαιρωτάτων τὸ ἐλεσθαι σιγὴν, καὶ μὴ ταῖς εὐσεβείαις ὡμῶν ἀκοαῖς ἐνιέναι πλείστακις, καθάπερ τι ναμα γλυκύ καὶ ζῶσποιον τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων τὴν γνῶσιν, ὅπερ ἡμῖν καὶ παλαὶ Θεὸς ὑπισχνεῖτο, λέγων διὰ φωνῆς Ἡσαίου· Καὶ ἀντλήσετε ὕδωρ μετ’ εὐφροσύνης ἐκ τῶν πηγῶν τοῦ σωτηρίου. Σωτηρίου δὲ πηγὰς εἶναι φαμέν, τοὺς ἁγίους προφῆτας εὐαγγελιστάς τε καὶ ἀποστόλους, οἱ τὸν ἀνῶθεν καὶ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ σωτηρίον τῷ κόσμῳ βρῶσιν λόγον, χορηγοῦντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἅπαντας τε οὕτω κατευφραίνουσι τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανόν. Φέρε τοῖνυν τοῖς εἰς τὰ βάθη τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐννοιῶν καθιέντες τὸν νοῦν τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν εὔρεσιν ἐκεῖθεν ἀντλήσωμεν. De recta fide ad Reg. lib. ii. in it. tom. v. P. 2. p. 128.

² Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐπέσθαι γραμμασιν ἀναγκαῖον ἡμᾶς, οὐδαμῶν παρεκτρέχοντας τὸ αὐτοῖς δοκῶν, φέρε λεγόμεν, τίνα δὴ τροπὸν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ δοξῇ λεγεται στεφανοῦν τὸν υἱόν· οὐκ οὐν αὐτὸς ποὺ φῆσιν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, κ. τ. λ. (Ib. p. 168.)

³ Ἐδεῖ μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν ταῖς θεοπνευστοῖς ἐνησκημένον γραφαῖς, εἴπερ ἡν ὁλῶς σκοποῖς αὐτῷ τοὺς περὶ τῶν θείων ἡμῖν μυστηρίων ποιεῖσθαι λόγους, τῶν ἱερῶν γραμ-

Still more strongly, in his Treatise on the Holy Trinity, he remarks, "All things, therefore, that have been delivered to us by the Law, and Prophets, and Apostles, we receive, and acknowledge, and confess; and *beyond these, we seek not to know anything*. For it is impossible for us to say, or at all think anything concerning God, *beyond what has been divinely declared by the divine oracles of the Old and New Testament.*"¹

And as it respects in particular the doctrine of the *consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father, and even the phrase itself, he says,—“So that if any one should say that the Son is of the same nature, and consubstantial with the Father, he would not be considered by us as having introduced any new and unusual phraseology; but he will be using a word that has, so to speak, *the chief seat in the inspired Scripture.*”²

ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM (fl. a. 412.)

“To ascertain that these things are so,” says Isidore of Pelusium, “let us inspect *the rule (or canon) of truth; I mean, the Holy Scriptures.*”³

And in opposition to the doctrine of Origen on the lapse of souls, he says that among other objections, two in particular seemed to him to be fatal to it; one of which

ματων διαμεμνησθαι μονον, εξυφαινειν τε οὕτως ἁγιοπρεπως την αφηγησιν, και μη μυθους ἡμιν αρχαιους και οδωδотas παρακομιζειν εις μεσον. Epist. ad Euoptium, præfix. tract. adv. Theodoret. pro xii. capit. tom. vi. p. 201.

¹ Παντα τοιουν τα παραδεδομενα ἡμιν δια τε νομου και προφητων και αποστολων δεχομεθα και γινωσκομεν και ὁμολογουμεν, ουδεν περαιτερω τουτων επιζητουντες. Αδυνατον γαρ παρα τα βειωδως ὑπο των θειων λογιων της τε παλαιας και καινης διαθηκης ἡμιν ειρημενα ειπειν τι περι Θεου, η ὁλως εννοησαι. De SS. Trinit. init. p. 2. tom. vi. fin.

² Ὡστε ει και τις ὁμοφυα τε και ὁμοουσιον ειναι λεγοι τω Πατρι τον Υιον, ουκ ασυνηθες τι κεκαινουργηκως ὡς εν ονοματων θεσει νοοιτ' αν ἡμιν, αλλ', ἰν' οὕτως ειπωμεν, τας πρωτας ἑδρας εχουση παρα γε τη θεοπνευστω γραφη τη τοιαδε λεξει χρησεται. De SS. Trin. Dial. 1. tom. v. P. 1. p. 392.

³ Ὅτι δε ταυτα οὕτως εχει, τον κανονα της αληθειας, τας θειας, φημι, γραφας κατοπτεισσωμεν. Τι ουν φησιν; κ. τ. λ. ISIDORI PELUS. Epist. lib. iv. Ep. 114. Ed. 1638. p. 475.

was, “*that it was not clearly delivered in the Scriptures.*”¹

THEODORET (fl. a. 423.)

I proceed to Theodoret, whose testimony in our favour is most clear and decisive.

First, as to Scripture being the sole authoritative rule of faith.

In the first of his Dialogues on the Divine Being, called from the name given in them to the heterodox disputant, *Eranistes*, he puts into the mouth of *Orthodox*, (the representative of his own views) the following observation ;—“ Do not bring me human reasonings and syllogisms, for I AM GOVERNED ONLY BY THE DIVINE SCRIPTURE.”²

And a little further on, the heterodox disputant having observed, “ You have explained this passage well ; but I should be glad to know how the antient doctors of the Church understood it,” Orthodox says,—“ You ought to have been ruled by the proofs afforded by the Apostles and Prophets. But since you also inquire for the interpretations of the holy Fathers, I will also, with God’s assistance, afford you this help.”³ So far, then, from bringing the interpretation of the Fathers as our authority for deducing such doctrines from Scripture, he, in both these passages, clearly repudiates everything but Scripture, as an authority by which we are to be governed.

But Mr. Newman quotes Theodoret, and would fain make us believe that his views were accordant with his own. “ In each of the three argumentative Dialogues,”

¹ Τον περι της εκπτώσεως λόγον, αληθὴ μὲν, ὥς οἶμαι, οὐκ ὄντα, πιθανόν δὲ δοκούντα, πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἀλλὰ, δύο δὲ κατὰ γὰρ τὸν ἡμετέρον λογισμόν, ἀνατρέπειν δοκεῖ· ἐν μὲν, τὸ μὴ σαφὲς κεκηρυχθαι ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς· δεύτερον δὲ ἡ ἀκρατος λήθη. *Id. ib. lib. iv. Ep. 163. pp. 504, 5.*

² Μὴ μοι λογισμούς καὶ συλλογισμούς ἀνθρώπινους προσενεγκῇς· ἐγὼ γὰρ μόνῃ πειθομαι τῇ θεῖᾳ γραφῇ. THEODORET. *Eran. Dialog. 1. (Op. ed. Schulz. tom. iv. p. 18.)*

³ Ἐδεῖ μὲν σε πεισθῆναι ταῖς ἀποστολικαῖς καὶ προφητικαῖς ἀποδείξεσιν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ τὰς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐρμηνείας ἐπιζητεῖς, ἐγὼ σοὶ καὶ ταυτὴν, συνθεῶ φαναι, προσοίσω τὴν θεραπείαν. *Ib. p. 43.*

says Mr. N., "of which his Eranistes is composed, we find the following significant arrangement, in accordance with Vincentius's direction already commented on—the arguments from Scripture come first, and then passages from the Fathers in illustration." True ; and a very good arrangement this, too ; and one which we may see in the writings of many of those whom the Tractators would stigmatize as violent "ultra Protestants ;" and an arrangement which, when coupled with the passages we have just quoted, and others which we shall quote presently, is "significant" of anything rather than an agreement between the views of Theodoret and Mr. Newman ; for he blames the person with whom he is arguing, for asking for the interpretations of the Fathers, after the testimonies that had been adduced from the Scriptures. What is still more extraordinary, Mr. N. quotes the very passage we have just cited, and adds to it these remarks,—“As if he said, it is not now the place for bringing mere authority ; I am *proving* the doctrine. Authority is well in its place, viz. before the controversy, but now our business is with Scripture.” (pp. 389, 90.) What can be the meaning of these words ? Theodoret is here speaking of the ground, or evidence, or *authority* upon which a doctrine is to be received ; and the only fit ground he declares to be a demonstration of it from Scripture. Mr. Newman, on the contrary, holds that the interpretation given to Scripture by the Fathers, is a necessary part of the evidence upon which a doctrine is to be received, a necessary part of the rule of faith ; on which supposition Orthodox was quite mistaken in supposing that his opponent ought to have been ruled by the passages of Scripture he had adduced. The request made, was just what ought to have been made, according to the scheme of the Tractators.

Nothing, however, can more completely prove the opposition of Theodoret's views to those of the Tractators, than the *first* passage we have quoted above, (one which Mr. Newman has very prudently omitted,) viz. “*For I am ruled ONLY by the divine Scripture.*”

And here we may notice, by the way, in reply to the notion of the Tractators that the (supposed) unity of sentiment among the early Fathers in fundamental points, is a proof of their having learnt their views from a successional delivery of an exposition of the faith, more full than what is contained in Scripture, and derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles, how Theodoret, when alluding to the agreement of various excellent men with each other, accounts for it. "I admire," he says, "these men for their agreement in the faith. For all of them gave the same interpretation of the evangelical declarations, as if they had been assembled together, and drawn up a joint exposition of their sentiments. ORTHODOX. Immense mountains and seas separate them one from another; but the distance has not injured their harmony. For *they were all taught by the same spiritual grace.*"¹

Many, also, are the passages in which he points us to the Scriptures as our sole authoritative rule.

Thus, in the same Dialogues, Eranistes having said, "The divine Peter hath said, 'Christ, therefore, having suffered for us in the flesh;'" Orthodox answers, "And with this agrees what I have said. For we have *learnt the rule (or, canon) of doctrines from the divine Scripture.*"²

Again, in his work on hæretical fables, he says, "The divine Scripture is my teacher in what I say."³

Again; "I exhort, therefore, those who fall in with this work, to compare the divine declarations with each of those wicked doctrines, and learn, by a careful comparison, how great the difference is between the false doc-

¹ Ἀγαμαι τῆς συμφωνίας τοὺς ἀνδρας. Ἄπαντες γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐρμηνείαν τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ῥητῶν ἐποίησαντο, ὥσπερ εἰς ταυτὸν συνελθόντες, καὶ τὸ κοινὴν δοξὰν συγγραφάντες. ΟΡΘ. Μεγίστα μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων καὶ ὄρη καὶ πελάγη διώστησιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν συμφωνίαν οὐκ ἐπῆμανεν ἡ διαστοασις. Ὑπο μίας γὰρ ἀπαντες πνευματικῆς ἐνηχηθήσαν χάριτος. Ib. p. 48.

² Ὁ θεὸς εἰρήκε Πέτρος, Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί. ΟΡΘ. Τουτῶ γε καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος συμφωνεῖ λόγος. Ἐκ γὰρ τῆς θείας γραφῆς μεμαθήκαμεν τὸν τῶν δογματῶν κανόνα. Ib. Dial. 3. p. 213.

³ Τῶν εἰρημενῶν διδασκαλὸς ἡ θεία γραφή. Id. Hæret. Fab. lib. v. c. 1. tom. iv. p. 377.

trine and the truth. . . . But these are the doctrines of the divine Spirit, which it behoves every one to follow continually, and to preserve the rule of these doctrines immovable ; and by this rule to direct himself.”¹

Further ; as to the perfection of Scripture, we may observe the following passages.

“The Scripture hath not used the word uncreated, but hath said that he is the Father. And I use that expression which Scripture has used Though the word uncreated may appear to accord with our views, yet piety permits us not to use it ; for otherwise Scripture would certainly have used it. . . . If it is written, I use the word ; if it is not written, I am under no necessity to use it I say not that to confess him to be uncreated, is what we cannot receive ; but that although it may appear to fall in with our views, yet, nevertheless, the word not being found anywhere in the divine Scripture, it is not necessary to use it. For if it was necessary, the divine Scripture would have used it.”²

“I do not say these things definitively. For I consider it presumptuous to speak definitively of things concerning which the divine Scripture does not speak *distinctly*. But I have said what I conceived was suitable to the views of piety.”³

“It does not become us to search after those things

¹ Παρακαλω τοιουνν τους εντευζομενους τηδε τη συγγραφη ἐκαστω των πονηρων εκεινων δογματων παραβαιναι τα θεια, και τη παρεξετασει καταμαβειν, οσον του ψευδους και της αληθειας το μεσον . . . ταυτα δε του θειου Πνευματος δογματα· οἷς ἐπεσθαι προσηκει διηνεκως, και τον τουτων ακλινη φυλαττειν κανονα, και τουτω την οικειαν διευθυνειν ψυχην. Ib. c. ult. p. 481.

² Αλλ’ ουκ ειπεν ἡ γραφη το αγενητον, το δε Πατερα αυτον ειναι ειπεν· κακεινο λεγω ὃ ἡ γραφη ειπεν . . . το αγενητον, καν δοκηταις εννοιαῖς ἡμων ὑποπιπτειν, αλλ’ ἡ ευσεβεια ουκ επιτρεπει λεγειν· εἰ δε μη, ειπεν αυτο παντως ἡ γραφη Εἰ γεγραπται, λεγω· εἰ δε ου γεγραπται, ουκ εχω αναγκην ειπειν ου λεγω οτι το αγενητον αυτον ὁμολογειν υπαραδεκτον εστιν ἡμιν· αλλ’ οτι καν δοκηταις εννοιαῖς ἡμων ὑποπιπτειν, αλλ’ ὁμως ὡς ουδαμου της θειας γραφης κειμενην την φωνην ουκ αναγκαιον λεγειν. Εἰ γαρ την αναγκαιον, ειπεν αν αυτο ἡ θεια γραφη. Id. De Sancta Trin. Dial. 2. tom. v. pp. 954—6.

³ Εγω δε ταυτα ουκ αποφαινομενος λεγω. Τολμηρον γαρ αποφαντικως ομαι λεγειν, περι ὧν ἡ θεια διαρρηδην ου λεγει γραφη· αλλ’ ὡς τοις ευσεβεσι λογισμοῖς αρμοστειν ὑπελαβον ειρηκα. Id. Quæst. in Genes. q. 4. tom. i. p. 8.

which are passed over in silence; but it behoves us to love those things which are written.”¹

“It is superfluous and unprofitable to inquire after those things which are passed over in silence.”²

“But we are instructed by these not to extinguish the Spirit, but to rekindle the grace which we have received; and to *introduce nothing foreign to the divine Scripture, but to be satisfied with the teaching of the Spirit*; and to hate the heresies of those, of whom some have added fables to the divine oracles, and others have honoured their own impious imaginations above the doctrine of Scripture.”³

“I am not so bold as to say anything which is passed over by the divine Scripture in silence.”⁴

Moreover, as to the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father being taught *fully and distinctly* by Scripture, we have the following testimony. “Answer me, my friend, [says Orthodox, in the Dialogues already quoted,] do we affirm that the substance of God the Father, and of the only-begotten Son, and of the most holy Spirit, is one; as we have been taught by the divine Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, and by the Fathers assembled at Nice, or do we follow the blasphemies of Arius?”⁵

Again; “ERANISTES. I said, at the commencement of our conversation, You nearly persuade me to become a

¹ Ου δεῖ ζητεῖν τὰ σεσιγημένα· στεργεῖν δὲ προσήκει τὰ γεγραμμένα. Id. ib. q. 45. tom. i. p. 57.

² Περίττον καὶ ἀνοήτον τὸ τὰ σεσιγημένα ζητεῖν. Id. Quæst. in Exod. q. 26. tom. i. p. 143.

³ Ἡμεῖς δὲ παιδευομεθα διὰ τούτων, μὴ σβεννύναι τὸ πνεῦμα, ἀλλ’ ἀναζωπυρεῖν ἢν ἐλάβομεν χάριν· καὶ μηδὲν ἀλλοτρίον ἐπεισαγεῖν τῇ θεῇ γραφῇ, ἀλλ’ ἀρκείσθαι τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ μυσάττεσθαι τὰς αἵρεσεις, ὧν οἱ μὲν μύθους τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις προσέθεσαν· οἱ δὲ τοὺς δυσσεβεῖς αὐτῶν λογισμοὺς τῆς γραφικῆς προετίμησαν διανοίας. Id. Quæst. in Levit. q. 9. tom. i. p. 187.

⁴ Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως εἰμι θράσους, ὥστε φαναι τι σεσιγημένον παρὰ τῇ θεῇ γραφῇ. Id. Eranist. Dial. 2. tom. iv. p. 122.

⁵ Ἀποκριναι, ὡ φιλότης, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, μιαν οὐσίαν φάμεν, ὥς παρὰ τῆς θείας γραφῆς ἐδιδάχθημεν παλαιὰς τε καὶ νέας, καὶ τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνεληλυθότων πατέρων, ἡ ταῖς Ἀρείου βλασφημίαις ἀκολουθοῦμεν; Id. Eranist. Dial. 1. tom. iv. p. 6.

consubstantialist. ORTHODOX. You ought to say, to become a Christian. For when you have become a Christian, you will acknowledge that it is necessary to say that the Son is consubstantial; *being taught it by the divine Scriptures*. For whatsoever things are proper to God, these things are common to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."¹

VINCENTIUS OF LIRINS (fl a. 434.)

We are now come to an author, whose writings are very confidently appealed to by the Romanists, and by Dr. Pusey and his party, as supporting their views, viz. Vincentius, "a Presbyter, in a monastery in the island of Lirins;"² and I do not hesitate to admit that some passages in his Treatise against the profane novelties of heretics, speak strongly of the authority of the Fathers; although they do not support our opponents in the grand fundamental position, that ecclesiastical tradition is to be considered as in substance the representative of the oral teaching of the Apostles, and so a divine informant. But I must also observe that, as it respects the value of patristical tradition, his statements differ very materially from those of the earlier Fathers; and further, *that the precept, for which his Treatise is more particularly celebrated, being in itself a useful direction in the investigation of the truth, may be, and is, quoted and approved, by many who do not attach to the results obtained by its application the same degree of authority, which he himself and others might be inclined to attribute to it*. We are far, indeed, from being disposed to slight the testimony to which that Treatise appeals, but regarding it only as human testimony, we do not look upon it as being a proper foundation for *faith* to rest upon. Nay, considering that Vincentius himself nowhere claims for it a divine origin, we feel some doubt whether

¹ Εἶπον καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου, Παρ' ὀλίγον με πείθεις ὁμοουσιαστὴν γενέσθαι. Ο. Γενοίτο σε εἰπεῖν, Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι· γενομένος συ γὰρ Χριστιανός, ἐπιγνώσῃ ὅτι ὁμοουσίον δεῖ λεγεῖν, ἀπο τῶν θείων γραφῶν διδάχθεις· ὅσα γὰρ ἰδία εἰσι Θεοῦ, τὰντα κοινὰ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. ID. De Sancta Trin. Dial. 1. tom. v. pp. 944, 5.

² GENNAD. Cat. vir. illustr.

he himself would have considered it in that light. But at any rate, a monk at Lirins is certainly not the man to dictate to the Church.

The following passages will give us a full view of his sentiments in this matter. I quote from the translation lately published at Oxford, that there may be no ground for cavil.

“ Enquiring often with great desire and attention of very many excellent, holy, and learned men, how and by what means I might assuredly, and, as it were, by some general and ordinary way, discern the true catholic faith from false and wicked heresy ; to this question, I had usually this answer of them all, that whether I or any other desired to find out the fraud of heretics daily springing up, and to escape their snares, and willingly would continue in a sound faith, himself safe and sound, that he ought, two manner of ways, by God’s assistance, to defend and preserve his faith ; that is, *first, by the authority of the law of God ; secondly, by the tradition of the Catholic Church.* Here some man, perhaps, may ask, seeing *the canon of the Scripture is perfect, and most abundantly of itself sufficient for all things*, what need we join unto it the authority of the Church’s understanding and interpretation ? The reason is this, because the Scripture being of itself so deep and profound, all men do not understand it in one and the same sense, but divers men diversely . . . and therefore very necessary it is, for the avoiding of so great windings and turnings of errors so various, that the line of expounding the Prophets and Apostles be directed and drawn according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and catholic sense. Again, within the Catholic Church itself we are greatly to consider that we hold that which hath been believed *everywhere, always, and of all men* : for that is truly and properly catholic, as the very force and nature of the word doth declare, which comprehendeth all things in general, after an universal manner ; and that shall we do if we follow *universality, antiquity, consent.* Universality shall we follow thus, if

we profess that one faith to be true, which the whole Church throughout the world acknowledgeth and confesseth. Antiquity shall we follow, if we depart not any whit from those senses, which it is plain that our holy elders and fathers generally held. Consent shall we likewise follow, if, in this very antiquity itself, we hold the definitions and opinions of all, or, at any rate, *almost all* the priests and doctors together. What, then, shall a *Catholic Christian* do, if some small part of the Church cut itself off from the communion of the universal faith? What else but prefer the health of the whole body before the pestiferous and corrupt member? What if some new infection goeth about to corrupt, not in this case only a little part, but the whole Church? Then, likewise, shall he regard, and be sure to cleave unto antiquity; which can now no more be seduced by any crafty novelty. What if, in antiquity itself, and amongst the ancient Fathers, be found some error of two or three men, or haply of some one city or province? Then shall he diligently take heed that he prefer the universal decrees and determinations of an antient General Council, if such there be, before the temerity or folly of a few. What if some such case happen where no such thing can be found? Then shall he labour, by conferring and laying them together amongst themselves, to refer to, and consult the antient Fathers' opinions, *not of all, but of those only*, which, living at divers times and sundry places, yet continuing in the communion and faith of one Catholic Church, were approved masters and guides to be followed; [or, rather, "masters *likely* to lead us right," *magistri probabiles*,] and whatsoever he perceiveth, not one or two, but *all jointly, with one consent, plainly, usually, constantly, to have holden, written, and taught*; let him know that this, without scruple or doubt, he ought to believe.¹ (§§ 2, 3. Oxf. ed. 1837.)

¹ *Sæpe igitur magno studio et summa attentione perquirens a quamplurimis sanctitate et doctrina præstantibus viris, quonam modo possim certa quadam et quasi generali ac regulari via, Catholicæ fidei veritatem ab hæreticæ pravi-*

The same advice he repeats elsewhere (§ 27,) but immediately after adds the following important exceptions; —“ Which antient consent, however, of holy Fathers, is not so carefully and diligently to be both sought for and followed in every small question of the Divine Law, *but only, or at least especially, in the rule of faith; neither yet*

tatis falsitate discernere, hujusmodi semper responsum ab omnibus fere retuli : Quod sive ego sive quis alius vellet exsurgentium hæreticorum fraudes deprehendere, laqueosque vitare, et in fide sana sanus atque integer permanere, duplici modo munire fidem suam Domino adjuvante deberet. Primo scilicet, divinæ legis auctoritate : tum deinde Ecclesiæ Catholicæ traditione. Hic forsitan requirat aliquis ; cum sit perfectus Scripturarum Canon, sibi que ad omnia satis superque sufficiat, quid opus est, ut ei Ecclesiasticæ intelligentiæ jungatur autoritas ? Quia videlicet Scripturam sacram pro ipsa sua altitudine non uno eodemque sensu universi accipiunt : sed ejusdem eloquia aliter atque aliter alius atque alius interpretatur : ut pene quot homines sunt, tot illinc sententiæ erui posse videantur . . . Atque idcirco multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut Propheticæ et Apostolicæ interpretationis linea secundum Ecclesiastici et Catholici sensus normam dirigatur. In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique quod semper quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere propriæque catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quæ omnia fere universaliter comprehendit. Sed hoc ita demum fiet : si sequamur universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem. Sequemur autem universitatem hoc modo, si hanc unam fidem veram esse fateamur, quam tota per orbem terrarum confitetur Ecclesia : antiquitatem vero ita, si ab his sensibus nullatenus recedamus, quos sanctos majores ac patres nostros celebrasse manifestum est : consensionem quoque itidem, si in ipsa vetustate omnium vel certe pene omnium sacerdotum pariter et magistrorum definitiones sententiasque sectemur. Quid igitur faciet Christianus Catholicus, si se aliqua Ecclesiæ particula ab universalis fidei communione præciderit ? Quid utique nisi ut pestifero corruptoque membro, sanitatem universi corporis anteponat ? Quid si novella aliqua contagio non jam portiunculam tantum sed totam pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur ? Tunc item providebit, ut antiquitati inhæreat ; quæ prorsus jam non potest ab ulla novitatis fraude seduci. Quid si in ipsa vetustate, duorum aut trium hominum, vel certe civitatis unius aut etiam provinciæ alicujus error deprehendatur ? Tunc omnino curabit, ut paucorum temeritati vel inscitæ si qua sunt universaliter antiquitus universalis concilii decreta præponat. Quid si tale aliquid emergat, ubi nihil hujusmodi reperitur ? Tunc operam dabit, ut collatas inter se majorum consulat interrogetque sententias : eorum duntaxat, qui diversis licet temporibus et locis in unius tamen Ecclesiæ Catholicæ communione et fide permanentes, magistri probabiles exstiterunt : et quicquid non unus aut duo tantum, sed omnes pariter, uno eodemque consensu, aperte, frequenter, perseveranter, tenuisse, scripsisse, docuisse cognoverit, id sibi quoque intelligat absque ulla dubitatione credendum.

VINCENT. LIRINENS. Commonit. §§ 2. 3. ed. Oxon. 1836.

are heresies always, nor all, after this sort to be impugned, but only such as be new and upstart ; to wit, at their first springing up, and before they have, as hindered by the shortness of time, falsified the rules of the antient faith ; and before that, the poison spreading farther, they go about to corrupt the Fathers' writings ; but those heresies which have already got ground, and be of some continuance, are not this way to be dealt withal ; because, by long tract of time, they have had long opportunity to steal the truth. And therefore such kind, whether of profane schisms or heresies, which be of longer standing, we must not otherwise convince, but only, if need be, by the authority of the Scriptures ; or else avoid and detest them as already convicted and condemned in old time by General Councils of Catholic priests. Therefore, so soon as any infectious error beginneth to break forth, and for her defence, to steal certain words of the divine law, and craftily and fraudulently to expound them ; straightways for the right understanding of the canon, the Fathers' judgments are to be gathered together, by which any whatsoever new, and therefore profane doctrine, growing up, may, without any shift, be detected ; and without any delay, be condemned. But those Fathers' opinions only are to be conferred together, which, with holiness, wisdom, and constancy lived, taught, and continued in the faith and communion of the Catholic Church ; and finally deserved either to die faithfully in Christ, or happily for Christ to be martyred : whom, notwithstanding, we are to believe with this condition, that whatsoever either all, or the greater part, with one and the same mind, plainly, commonly, and constantly, as it were, in a council of doctors agreeing together, have confirmed by receiving it, holding it, and delivering it ; let that be accounted for undoubted, for certain and acknowledged truth. And whatsoever any, although holy and learned, although a bishop, although a confessor and martyr, hath holden otherwise than all, or against all, let that be put aside from the authority of the common, public, and general judgment, and reputed

among his own proper private and secret opinions, lest, with the utmost danger of our eternal salvation, we do, according to the custom of sacrilegious heretics and schismatics, forsake the truth of the universal doctrine, and follow the novel error of some one man." (§ 28.) ¹

"We said in the premises, that this always hath been, and even at this day is, the custom of Catholics, to try and examine true faith by these two manner of ways. First, by the authority of the Divine canon; secondly, by the tradition of the Catholic Church: *not because the canonical Scripture is not as to itself sufficient for all things*, but because very many expounding God's word at their own pleasure, do thereby conceive divers opinions and errors. And for that cause it is necessary that the inter-

¹ Quæ tamen antiqua sanctorum Patrum consensio, non in omnibus divinæ legis quæstiunculis, sed solum vel certe præcipue in fidei regula magno nobis studio et investiganda est et sequenda. Sed neque semper neque omnes hæreses hoc modo impugnandæ sunt, sed novitiæ recentesque tantummodo, cum primum scilicet exoriuntur, antequam infalsarint vetustæ fidei regulas, ipsius temporis vetentur angustiis, ac priusquam manante latius veneno majorum volumina vitare conentur. Cæterum dilatatæ et inveteratæ hæreses nequaquam hac via aggrediendæ sunt, eo quod prolixo temporum tractu longa iis furandæ veritatis patuerit occasio. Atque ideo quascunque illas antiquiores, vel schismaticum vel hæreseon prophanitates, nullo modo nos oportet, nisi aut sola, si opus est, Scripturarum auctoritate convincere, aut certe jam antiquitus universalibus sacerdotum Catholicorum conciliis convictas damnatasque vitare. Itaque cum primum mali cujusque erroris putredo erumpere cœperit, et ad defensionem sui, quædam sacræ legis verba furari, eaque fallaciter et fraudulenter exponere, statim interpretando canonum majorum sententiæ congregandæ sunt, quibus illud quodcunque exsurgat novitium, ideoque prophanum, et absque ulla ambage prodatur, et sine ulla retractatione damnetur. Sed eorum duntaxat Patrum sententiæ conferendæ sunt, qui in fide et communione catholica sancte, sapienter, constanter viventes, docentes, et permanentes, vel mori in Christo fideliter, vel occidi pro Christo feliciter meruerunt. Quibus tamen hac lege credendum est, ut quicquid vel omnes, vel plures, uno eodemque sensu manifeste, frequenter, perseveranter, velut quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum concilio, accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo, firmaverint, id pro indubitato certo ratoque habeatur. Quicquid vero, quamvis ille sanctus et doctus, quamvis Episcopus, quamvis Confessor et Martyr, præter omnes, aut etiam contra omnes senserit, id inter proprias et occultas, et privatas opiniunculas, a communis publicæ ac generalis sententiæ auctoritate secretum sit: ne cum summo æternæ salutis periculo, juxta sacrilegam hæreticorum et schismaticorum consuetudinem, universalis dogmatis antiqua veritate dimissa, unius hominis novitium sectemur errorem. Id. ib. § 28.

pretation of the heavenly Scripture be directed according to the one only rule of the Church's understanding : *only be it observed, especially in those questions upon which the foundations of the whole Catholic doctrine do depend.* Likewise we said that, even within the Church, we were to look to the consent, both of universality and antiquity, that so we be neither carried away from sound unity to the side of schism, nor yet cast headlong from antiquity of religion into heretical novelties. We said, also, that in ecclesiastical antiquity itself, we were diligently to observe, and seriously to consider two things,—unto which all those that will not be heretics, must, of necessity, cling fast. The first is, that which hath, in old time, been determined by all the priests of the Catholic Church, by authority of a General Council. The second is, that if any new question did arise, in which that were not to be found, we ought to have recourse to the sayings of the holy Fathers ; but yet of those only who, in their time and place, were approved masters [*magistri probabiles*], being such as continued in the unity of the communion and faith ; and whatsoever we find that they held with one mind and one consent, to judge that without all scruple to be the true and catholic doctrine of the Church." (§ 29.)¹

¹ Diximus in superioribus hanc fuisse semper et esse hodieque Catholicorum consuetudinem, ut fidem veram duobus his modis approbent. Primum, divini canonis auctoritate, deinde Ecclesiæ Catholicæ traditione ; non quia canon solus non sibi ad universa sufficiat, sed quia verba divina pro suo plerique arbitrato interpretantes varias opiniones erroresque concipiant, atque ideo necesse sit, ut ad unam Ecclesiastici sensus regulam Scripturæ cælestis intelligentia dirigatur ; in iis duntaxat præcipue quæstionibus, quibus totius Catholici dogmatis fundamenta nituntur. Item diximus, in ipsa rursus Ecclesia unitatis integritate et antiquitatis consensionem spectari oportere, ne aut ab unitatis integritate in partem schismatis abrumpamur, aut e vetustatis religione in hæreseon novitates præcipitemur. Item diximus in ipsa Ecclesiæ vetustate duo quædam vehementer studioseque observanda, quibus penitus inhærere deberent, quicunque hæretici esse nollent. Primum si quid esset antiquitus ab omnibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sacerdotibus universalis concilii auctoritate decretum. Deinde si qua nova exsurgeret quæstio, ubi id minime reperiretur, recurrendum ad Sanctorum Patrum sententias, eorum duntaxat, qui suis quique temporibus et locis, in unitate communionis et fidei perma-

“ Necessary it is for *all Catholics which desire to show themselves true children of their mother the Church*, to adhere, stick close, and hold, even to death, unto the holy faith of their holy Fathers ; but to detest and abhor, pursue and drive out, the profane novelties of all profane men whatsoever.” (§ 33.)¹

These are the passages in which Vincentius has stated his views on the subject before us ; and we cannot but observe that, in many material points, they differ from those of Dr. Pusey and his party. In the first place, there is not the slightest intimation that the consent of the Catholic Fathers is to be received as the representative of the oral teaching of the Apostles, and thus *a divine informant*,—a point which, had Vincentius held, he could not have failed here to notice.

And one of our opponents’ own referees, Bishop Stillingfleet, tells us that Vincentius here “ speaks of such an universal tradition, which depends wholly upon antiquity, universality, and consent ; and never so much as mentions, much less pretends to, anything of infallibility.” . . . “ Vincentius speaks of such a kind of tradition as hath no connexion with infallibility. For if Vincentius had even in the least thought of any such thing, so great and zealous an opposer of heresies could not have left out that which had been more to his purpose than all that he had said.”²

Nay, it is obvious that he did not trace their consent to this source ; for he says ;—“ The holy and catholic consent of which blessed Fathers, lest any man think that he may rashly contemn, the Apostle saith, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, ‘ And some verily hath God set in his

nentes, magistri probabiles exstitissent ; et quidquid uno sensu atque consensu tenuisse invenirentur, id Ecclesiæ verum et catholicum absque ullo scrupulo judicaretur. Id. ib. § 29.

¹ Necesse est profecto omnibus deinceps catholicis, qui sese Ecclesiæ matris legitimos filios probare student, ut sanctæ sanctorum Patrum fidei inhæreant, adglutinentur, immoriantur, prophanas vero prophanorum novitates detestentur, horrescant, insectentur, persequantur. Id. ib. § 33.

² Rat. Grounds of Prot. Rel. Pt. 1. c. 9. pp. 278, 9.

Church, first Apostles ;' of which himself was one : ' secondly, prophets,' as Agabus was, of whom we read in the Acts : ' thirdly, doctors,' which now are called expounders ; whom, also, this Apostle sometime nameth prophets ; because, by them, are expounded and declared to the people the mysteries of the prophets ; these, therefore, divinely disposed and placed in the Church of God, at divers times and sundry places, *agreeing all in one mind in Christ*, touching the understanding of catholic doctrine, whosoever contemneth, doth not condemn man, but God." (§ 28.)¹ In this passage we may clearly see the ground upon which he rests the claims of that consent of which he speaks.

Moreover, he warns us, in a passage already quoted, that " this consent is not to be sought for and followed with great care by us in all the small questions of the divine law, but *only, or at any rate principally, in the rule of faith ;*" (§ 28.) that is, as he says in the next section, " those questions *upon which the foundations of the whole Catholic doctrine do depend.*" So that he who pleads consent of Fathers as determining anything beyond the rule of faith ; that is according to the well-known patristical use of the term, the creed, or those points upon which the foundations of the whole Catholic faith rest, cannot quote Vincentius as supporting him in so doing. How far, then, Dr. Pusey and his party gain any great practical benefit for their cause from this Treatise of Vincentius, I leave the reader to judge.

But to this very important limitation to the use of the general rule, the Tractators pay no attention ; but, on the

¹ Quorum beatorum Patrum Sanctum Catholicumque consensum, ne quis sibi temere forte contemnendum arbitretur, ait in prima ad Corinth. Apostolus : [Vide 1 Cor. xii. 26. Simil. Eph. iv. 11.] Et quosdam quidem posuit Deus in ecclesia, primum Apostolos, quorum ipse unus erat : Secundo Prophetas, qualem in Actibus Apostolorum legimus Agabum : tertio, Doctores, qui Tractatores nunc appellantur, quos hic idem Apostolus etiam Prophetas interdum nuncupat, eo quod per eos Prophetarum mysteria populis aperiantur. Hos ergo in Ecclesia Dei divinitus per tempora et loca dispensatos, quisquis in sensu Catholici dogmatis unum aliquid in Christo sentientes contempserit, non hominem contemnit, sed Deum. Id. ib. § 28.

contrary, apply the rule continually to those cases in which we are warned by Vincentius not to apply it. The controversy which they have raised in the Church, respects, as they must be well aware, points to which Vincentius did not intend his rule to apply; and therefore, at any rate, with the exception of the single point of the degree of weight due to the writings of the Fathers on the points of faith recognized by the early Church as *fundamental*, the Treatise of Vincentius is against their patristical appeals.

Further; he allows that only *new* heresies ought to be so attacked, and not those which are old; whose authors have had the opportunity of corrupting the Fathers' writings. These latter, he admits, are to be condemned only by the authority of the Scriptures; or else avoided, as already condemned by General Councils of Catholic priests. (§ 28.)

What is more, and is directly opposed to the statements of our opponents, he affirms plainly and with reiteration, that "THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE IS PERFECT, AND MOST ABUNDANTLY (SATIS SUPERQUE) OF ITSELF SUFFICIENT FOR ALL THINGS." (§ 2, and again § 29.) And if such is the case, it can be only the *negligence* of man that prevents his obtaining a knowledge of what it reveals *from itself*. In fact, it is quite inconsistent with this admission to say, as Vincentius seems to do elsewhere, that patristical tradition is necessary to enable us to understand the faith; in which also he is, as we shall hereafter see, opposed to earlier and far better authorities, Chrysostom and Augustine for instance, who unequivocally affirm that Scripture is clear in all the fundamentals.

Still further; the general tenor of the advice here given by Vincentius as to our consulting the writings of the great lights of the Church from the beginning, to ascertain what they held as to the great fundamental truths of Christianity, is such as no sane man will dispute the propriety of. The writings of the most learned and pious among the Fathers are appealed to by men of all opinions

and parties, and every man feels their support, especially the concurrent support of a great number of them, to be the strongest confirmatory argument for the truth, next to Scripture, though at an immeasurable distance.

Hence the rule of Vincentius as to the mode of ascertaining catholic consent has been frequently quoted and approved by Protestant writers; who, however, are not answerable for all that he may have said in his treatise; and *as far as the rule can be applied*, it is a very good and useful one; but as to that consent which fully answers his description, we say with Bishop Stillingfleet, "Wise men who have thoroughly considered of Vincentius his way, though in general they cannot but approve of it so far as to think it highly improbable that there should be antiquity, universality, and consent against the true and genuine sense of Scripture, yet when they consider this way of Vincentius, with all those cautions restrictions and limitations set down by him, they are apt to think that HE HATH PUT MEN TO A WILD-GOOSE CHASE TO FIND OUT ANYTHING ACCORDING TO HIS RULES; and that *St. Augustine spake a great deal more to the purpose when he spake concerning all the writers of the Church, that although they had never so much learning and sanctity, he did not think it true because they thought so, but because they persuaded him to believe it true, either from the authority of Scripture, or some probable reason.*"¹ Nevertheless, it is evident, that to nothing less than a consent which answers his description are we entitled to attribute, upon his authority, the weight which he attaches only to that of which he speaks.

The only point, then, in which Vincentius can be appealed to as supporting the views of the Tractators, is the authority he attributes to a certain concurrent testimony of Fathers on points entering into what he calls the rule of faith; and the question is, are we to suppose that he held such consent to be binding upon the conscience, or only a strong persuasive argument? I willingly admit,

¹ Grounds of Prot. Rel. Pt. i. c. 9. p. 279.

that of the authority of such consent he has spoken in strong terms, but then it must be remembered that he is speaking to the professed members of his own communion, and his meaning may be no more than this,—that if they wished to belong to that communion, their belief, as it respected fundamental points, must agree with those of the received doctors of that communion. That communion he of course called, as he considered it to be, the Church. But would he have addressed heretics in the same way? Would he have said to them, The consent of those whom I call the orthodox Fathers has authority over your faith as containing the substance of a divine revelation? I doubt whether he would. And if he had, of this I am sure, that the earlier Fathers would not have done so; of which we have one direct proof in the case of Augustine, already mentioned, who, in reasoning with Maximinus, gives up the binding authority even of the Council of Nice. Indeed, the absurdity of the thing is evident. For the question is, which is the orthodox doctrine in the fundamentals of Christianity? And the wise plan here suggested for determining it would then be, that we must abide by the decision of the orthodox. Which leaves us just as much at a loss as ever. For how are we to know who the orthodox are, if we do not know what the orthodox doctrine is? And nothing is gained by taking for granted what involves the very thing to be proved, viz. which are the orthodox.

And we cannot but observe that there is one striking difference between his Treatise and the observations of the earlier Fathers upon the same subject; and that is, the want of any reference to Spiritual teaching. In a Treatise written to instruct men how to preserve themselves from the contagion of heresy, not a hint is to be found directing men to seek that Spiritual teaching, which alone will lead them into any saving knowledge of the truth, and the necessity of which is so strongly insisted on by the earlier Fathers, as we shall abundantly show presently.

Amid all his protestations of regard for the Fathers, he

seems wholly to have forgotten their observations respecting the expectation we are encouraged to entertain that God will accompany the reading of his own word with a blessing, which he has not promised to the writings of men, and that the Holy Spirit is promised to lead the earnest and sincere inquirer to the knowledge of the meaning of his own word.

And however inconvenient it may be that men should support the vagaries of their own brains under the idea that the Spirit of God has taught them that such is the meaning of the word of God, will the Tractators guarantee us that none of those who conduct their inquiry upon their principles, shall weary us with the vagaries of other men's brains? Men are at least as likely, I think, to take up unfounded notions from a reliance upon patristical tradition, as from a reliance upon the promised aid of God's Holy Spirit in the humble and sincere perusal of Scripture.

Lastly, it should not be forgotten that there is strong reason to suppose that this Treatise of Vincentius was written for the purpose of supporting Semipelagianism. That Vincentius was a Semipelagian is tolerably clear, and that he wrote a Semipelagian work against Augustine;¹ and these views were apparently held in common with him by the monks of his monastery.² Now the Semipelagians defended themselves on the ground that they had antiquity on their side, and brought against Augustine the charge of novelty;³ and, consequently, in all probability, this work, written professedly to show that antiquity was to be followed, and novelty avoided, was written merely to aid his party in this controversy.

It appears to me, that there is much truth in the following observations of the learned Dr. Rainoldes on this subject, in his Conference with Hart, whom I quote, not as an authority, but as a witness worthy for his *learning* to be heard on such a point.

¹ Cave, Hist. Lit. vol. i. p. 425.

² Cave, *ibid.*

³ See Prosp. ad August. Ep. and Cave.

“ I liked,” he says, “ his [i. e. Vincentius’s] judgment in the general point touching *the sufficiency and perfectness of Scriptures*, which I know *you like not, though you make greater semblance of liking him than I*. If in the particulars I mislike somewhat, let the blame be laid upon the blameworthy; not me who *stand to that which he hath spoken well*, but *him who falleth from it*. For laying his foundation as it were on a rock, he buildeth up his house beside it on the sand. That Scripture is sufficient alone against heretics, so that it be taken in the right sense expounded by the rules of the catholic faith; this hath he well avouched as on the rock of God’s word. But that the rules of faith and sense of the Scripture must be tried and judged by the consent, antiquity, and universality of the Church, this hath he added not so well as on the sand of men’s opinions. The difference of the points may be perceived by St. Austin, who, joining in the former of them with Vincentius, doth leave him in the latter. For Austin, as he setteth the ground of religion in the right sense and catholic meaning of the Scripture; so teacheth he that this must be known and tried by the Scripture itself, the infallible rule of truth, not by the fickle minds of men. (De Doctr. Christ. ch. 2. div. 2.) And to have taught hereof as Austin doth, it had agreed best with the foundation of Vincentius; which maketh the rule of Scriptures alone sufficient for all things. But because the weaker and ruder sort of Christians have not skill to know the right exposition of Scripture from the wrong, therefore he, tempering himself to their infirmity, doth give them outward sensible marks to know it by. Wherein he dealeth with them as if a philosopher, having said that a man is a reasonable creature, should, because his scholars cannot discern of reason, (whereof the show is such in many brute beasts that some have thought them reasonable) describe him more plainly by outward marks and accidents, as namely, that he hath two feet and no feathers. They report that Plato defined a man so: a man is a living creature, two-footed, unfeathered. For

which definition, when he was commended, Diogenes took a capon, and having plucked his feathers off, did bring him in to the school of Plato, saying, This is Plato's man. The holy word of God is the same in the Church that reason is in a man. Whereupon we give it for an essential mark, as I may term it, of the Church, by which the Church is surely known and discerned. But the show of God's word is such in many heretics, as of reason in brute beasts, that some who have no skill to discern that mark, do think it impossible to know the Church by it. Your fellows hereupon describe the Church by outward and accidental marks, as namely, by antiquity, succession, consent. These are very plausible, and many do commend them highly. But he that hath half an eye of a philosopher, I mean a wise Christian, need not play Diogenes in plucking feathers off to show that these marks may agree to a capon." (Ed. 1584. pp. 191—3.)

These are the observations of a man pre-eminently learned, and one therefore whose testimony on such a point, i. e. as to the uncertainty of the evidence afforded by what passes under the name of antiquity, succession, and consent, is entitled to great regard. And the mistakes and misrepresentations of Vincent in the application of his own rule, in his observations for instance as to Agrippinus and Nestorius, to which we have already referred in former parts of this work, are alone sufficient to make us cautious in the matter.

SALVIAN (fl. a. 440.)

"If," says Salvian, "you wish to know what is to be held, you have the Sacred Scriptures to refer to."¹

"Condemn me, if I shall not show that the Holy Scriptures also have affirmed that which I assert."²

¹ Si scire vis quid tenendum sit, habes literas sacras. SALVIAN. De Gubern. Dei, lib. iii. (Ed. Par. 1669. p. 42.)

² Condemna, si id quod assero non etiam Scripturas sacras dixisse monstravero. Ib. Lib. iv. p. 85.

“The teaching of the evangelical volumes is full of every kind of perfection.”¹

PROSPER (fl. a. 444.)

Prosper giving a figurative interpretation to those words, “who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain,” (Ps. civ. 2.) or skin, as he translates it, says,—“that the holy Scripture is called heaven, the authority of which God at the beginning placed as a firmament in his Church, and which by the ministry of preachers he extended as a skin over the whole world.”² An interpretation whimsical enough doubtless, but showing nevertheless the view he took of the exclusive claims of Scripture.

And in another work passing under his name, it is said, “What, therefore, may be the causes of these differences under the same dispensation of grace, or what the reasons, who shall say, since the Holy Scriptures do not say?”³

COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES (fl. a. 535.)

“It behoveth not a perfect Christian,” saith Cosmas, “to attempt to confirm anything from those [writings] that are doubted of, the canonical and commonly received Scriptures *explaining all things sufficiently*, both concern-

¹ Evangelicorum voluminum plenam omni perfectionis genere doctrinam. Ib. Lib. iii. p. 45.

² ‘Extendens cœlum sicut pellem’ . . . Si figuratam significationem adnitamur inspicere, invenimus extendere Deum cœlum sicut pellem, cum intelligimus Sanctam Scripturam cœlum appellatum, cujus auctoritatem primo quasi firmamentum in Ecclesia sua posuit, et quam super omnem orbem terrarum per ministeria prædicantium quasi pellem extendit. PROSPER. In Psalm ciii. [al. civ.] Op. ed. Par. 1711. col. 382.

³ Quæ itaque causæ sint harum sub eadem gratia dissimilitudinum, quæ rationes, sanctis Scripturis non loquentibus quis loquatur? De vocat. gent. lib. ii. c. 9. Op. col. 895. This work, however, is supposed by Vossius to have been written by Prosper Aurelianensis, who lived at the beginning of the next century. (See Cave.) The reader may, therefore, if he please, refer it to that period.

ing the heavens and the earth and the elements, and *every doctrine received by Christians.*"¹ And surely such a man, who had travelled far and wide, was likely, if any, to take a *catholic* view of the matter.

ANASTASIUS OF ANTIOCH (fl. a. 561.)

We cannot well have a clearer testimony upon the whole of the first four points than what is contained in few words in the following remark of Anastasius.

"It is clear," he says, "that those things which the divine Scripture has passed over are not to be inquired into; for all things which tend to our profit the Holy Spirit has dispensed and administered to us."² This brief sentence will be found, upon consideration, to include everything for which we contend.

GREGORY (fl. a. 590.)

We close our list with the celebrated Gregory.

Commenting on Job xxviii. 1. "There is a vein for the silver, and a place for gold where they fine it," he says,—"*By silver eloquence, by gold celebrity of life or wisdom, is usually designated. And since the heretics so boast of the beauty of their eloquence, that they care not to strengthen themselves by the authority of the sacred books, (which books are as certain veins of silver in respect to what we say, since from them we derive what we say,) he recalls them to the pages of sacred authority, that if they wish to speak the truth, they ought to take from thence what they say. And he says, 'The silver has the sources of*

¹ Ου χρη ουν τον τελειον χριστιανον εκ των αμφιβαλλομενων επιστηριζεσθαι, των ενδιαθετων και κοινως ωμολογημενων γραφων ικανως παντα μηνυοντων, περι τε των ουρανων και της γης και των στοιχειων και παντος του δογματος των Χριστιανων. COSM. INDIC. De Mundo, lib. vii. in Coll. Nov. Script. Montf. vol. ii. p. 292.

² Quod quæ silentio præterit Scriptura divina non sint scrutanda, est perspicuum. Omnia enim quæ faciunt ad nostram utilitatem dispensavit et administravit Spiritus Sanctus. ANASTAS. ANTIOCH. Anag. Contempl. in Hexam. lib. viii. *init.* (Bibl. Patr. ed. Col. 1618, et seq. Tom. vi. P. 1. p. 666.)

its veins ;' as if he were clearly to say, He who would prepare himself to preach the true gospel, must *take the grounds of his arguments from the sacred pages, that he may reduce everything he says to the foundation of divine authority, and upon it build the edifice of his speech.*"¹

And to Scripture he sends us as the Judge of controversies. "A man full of right faith . . . collects together those very testimonies of Holy Scripture which the heretic produces, and *thence refutes his error* When we overcome the heretics, boasting and bringing against us sentences of Holy Scripture, by the same words and sentences which they adduce, we as it were behead the proud Goliath with his own sword. Therefore the just man is clothed with those garments which the unjust prepares ; because the holy man uses the same passages in support of the truth by which every perverse heretic endeavours to show himself learned against the truth."²

Moreover, in his view Scripture declares the whole faith ; for "by it," he says, "God speaks *all he desires.*"³

¹ Job xxviii. 1. 'Habet argentum, venarum suarum principia ; et auro locus est in quo conflatur.' In argento eloquium, in auro vitæ vel sapientiæ claritas designari solet. Et quia hæretici sic de eloquii sui nitore superbunt, ut nulla sacrorum librorum auctoritate solidentur, (qui libri ad loquendum nobis quasi quædam argenti venæ sunt, quia de ipsis locutionis nostræ originem trahimus) eos ad sacræ auctoritatis paginas revocat : ut si vere loqui desiderant, inde sumere debeant quid loquantur. Et ait, 'Habet argentum, venarum suarum principia.' Ac si aperte dicat ; Qui ad veræ prædicationis verba se præparat, necesse est ut causarum origines a sacris paginis sumat, ut omne quod loquitur ad divinæ auctoritatis fundamentum revocet, atque in eo ædificium locutionis suæ firmet. GREGOR. M. Moral. sive Expos. in Job. Lib. xviii. c. 26. (Op. ed. Bened. Par. 1705. Tom. i. col. 573.)

² Vir recta fide plenus ea ipsa Scripturæ sacræ quæ hæreticus affert testimonia colligit, et erroris ejus pertinaciam inde convincit cum superbientes hæreticos et sacræ Scripturæ sententias deferentes eisdem verbis atque sententiis quas proferunt vincimus, quasi elatum Goliath suo gladio detruncamus. Justus ergo vestitur eis vestimentis quæ præparat injustus ; quia vir sanctus eisdem sententiis ad veritatem utitur quibus se perversus quisque doctum ostendere contra veritatem conatur. Id. Moral. sive Exp. in Job. c. xxvii. vv. 16, 17. Lib. xviii. c. 16. Tom. i. col. 566, 7.

³ Per eam [i. e. Scripturam] Deus loquitur omne quod vult. Id. ibid. Lib. xvi. c. 35. Tom. i. col. 517.

“In this volume, all things that edify, all things that instruct, are contained in writing.”¹

Again, commenting on the passage, “They dwell by the abundant rivers,” he says,—“While they adhere altogether to the directions of Scripture, so as to do nothing but what the Scriptures exhort, they as it were evade the enemy, by throwing themselves into the water. And they [i. e. the Scriptures] are called abundant rivers, because on whatsoever points of difficulty counsel is sought in the Scriptures, it is found there fully on all points, without any deficiency.”²

“Elihu, foreseeing that God would form the Holy Scripture, that in it he might reply to both the public and private questions of all, says, ‘Do you contend with him for not having answered all your words? God will speak once, and will not a second time repeat the same thing.’ As if he should say, God answers not the hearts of each individual by secret words, but constructs such a speech as that by it he may satisfy the questions of all. To wit in the declarations of his Scripture we each, if we seek, find what we are inquiring for.”³

“What, indeed, is the Holy Scripture, but a Letter of the omnipotent God to his creature? . . . Study, therefore, I beseech you, and daily meditate upon the words of

¹ In hoc volumine cuncta quæ ædificant omnia quæ erudiant scripta continentur. Id. In Ezech. lib. i. hom. 9. ad fin. Tom. i. col. 1264.

² ‘Resident juxta fluentia plenissima’ Dum se consiliis Scripturæ ex toto addicunt, ut videlicet nihil agant nisi quod ex responso Scripturarum audiunt, quasi in aquam se projicientes hosti illudunt. Quæ fluentia plenissima dicuntur, quia de quibuscumque scrupulis in Scripturis consilium quæritur sine minoratione de omnibus ad plenum invenitur. Id. In Cant. c. 5. v. 12. Tom. iii. P. 2. col. 440.

³ Eliu autem prævidens quod Scripturam sacram Dominus conderet, ut in ea vel publicis vel occultis cunctorum quæstionibus responderet, ait, ‘Adversus eum contendis, quod non ad omnia verba responderit tibi. Semel loquetur Deus et secundo id ipsum non repetet.’ Ac si diceret,—Deus singulorum cordibus privatis vocibus non respondet, sed tale eloquium construit per quod cunctorum quæstionibus satisfaciatur. In Scripturæ quippe ejus eloquio causas nostras singuli, si requirimus, invenimus. Id. Moral. sive Expos. in Job. Lib. xxiii. c. 19. Tom. i. col. 747.

your Creator; *learn the mind of God in the words of God.*"¹

SECT. IV.—WHETHER SCRIPTURE IS THE SOLE DIVINE RULE
OF PRACTICE.

I now proceed to consider the testimony of the Fathers on the question, Whether Scripture is the sole *divine* Rule of practice.

That it is so on all matters *necessary to salvation*, the passages we have already quoted in the last section, are, I hope, amply sufficient to prove to have been the general opinion of the Fathers, and one which they very earnestly insisted upon.

But, as it respects the question whether there are any rites or practices among non-essentials, not mentioned in Scripture, which have an *indubitable right* to be considered as of Apostolical institution, and a proportionate claim upon our regard, I admit that some of the Fathers appear occasionally inclined to support the affirmative.

Nevertheless, even here we maintain that some of them have distinctly advocated the view for which we contend; and that others who appear in some parts of their writings to take the opposite view, have elsewhere so modified those statements, as to leave their testimony, upon the whole, but little different, to all practical purposes, to that of the former; and further that, even were it not so, our opponents, both Romanists and Tractators, could not consistently maintain that such (supposed) Apostolical traditions are obligatory on us, because they do not themselves adopt them all.

First, then, we maintain that some of the Fathers distinctly advocate the view that *in all points* Holy Scripture is the sole divine Rule of practice.

¹ Quid est autem Scriptura sacra nisi quædam Epistola omnipotentis Dei ad creaturam suam? Stude ergo, quæso, et quotidie Creatoris tui verba meditare; disce cor Dei in verbis Dei. Id. Epist. lib. iv. Ep. 31. ad Theodorum Medicum. Tom. ii. col. 712.

For instance the testimony of

CYPRIAN (fl. a. 248.)

to this is plain and distinct; as appears by the extracts already given from his writings in a preceding part of this volume.¹ So clear, indeed, is his testimony, that a learned Roman Catholic writer finds fault, as we have seen, with some of his own communion, for quoting him as favourable to the Romish view of the question; confessing that "*Cyprian acknowledged no other tradition than what is contained in the Scriptures.*"²

And to Cyprian we may, I think without hesitation, add,

FIRMILIAN OF CÆSAREA (fl. a. 233.)

who, in his Letter to Cyprian,³ very strongly expresses his approval of what Cyprian had written to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, on the question of rebaptization, as quoted above;⁴ and ridicules the plea of Stephen that their customs at Rome were derived from Apostolical tradition, as one evidently contradicted by fact;⁵ and having, as he thinks, proved from Scripture, that the practice he followed was the right one, he says, "Who is so vain as to prefer custom to truth?"⁶ adding, "But we to truth join also custom, and to the custom of the Romans oppose custom; but the custom of truth; *holding this to have been from the beginning which was delivered by Christ and the Apostle;*"⁷ i. e. in the Scriptures, to which he had been referring. "Nor do we recollect," he says, "that this had any beginning with us, since it was always observed here."⁸

Putting these passages together (and we have only this one Epistle to judge from), it seems tolerably clear that

¹ Sep. 317—25 above.

² See p. 323 above.

³ Inter Cypriani Epist. ep. 75, *init.*

⁴ See pp. 317, 18 above.

⁵ See the passage quoted vol. 1. pp. 335 and 433.

⁶ Quis tam vanus sit, ut veritati consuetudinem præferat. *Ib.*

⁷ See vol. i. p. 334.

⁸ See *ib.*

Firmilian's view on the point now in question, was the same as that of Cyprian; especially when we observe that while he claimed *immemorial* usage in favour of the custom in his own parts, he did not place its observance on that ground, but on the directions of Scripture.

That the name of Apostolical tradition was mistakenly pleaded for practices in use in the primitive church, others of the Fathers will tell us, as we have already had occasion to notice, in the case of the controversy as to the observance of Easter;¹ and Irenæus admits that this might arise from some bishops being negligent, and allowing that to go down to posterity as a custom which was introduced through simplicity and ignorance.²

And hence men of experience and judgment among them saw the necessity of Scripture proof in such matters, before anything could be confidently affirmed to have sprung from Apostolical tradition, as we see in the testimony of another witness in our favour among the Fathers, whose "peculiar judgment and diligence" are praised, both by the Romanist Valesius, and our own Cave, namely,

SOCRATES THE HISTORIAN (fl. a. 439.)

Speaking of the difference in the Church as to the time of observing Easter, some saying that their custom was derived from John, others theirs from Peter and Paul, Socrates adds,—“But none of these can show a *Scriptural demonstration* concerning these things. I thence conjecture, therefore, that the feast of Easter is observed in each place rather from some custom.” And a little further on, he says,—“*And since no one can show*

¹ See vol. i. pp. 323 et seq. and ROUTH Reliq. S. vol. i. pp. 391 &c. See, also, DIONYS. ALEX. Ep. Canon. in Routh Reliq. S. vol. ii. pp. 385 &c. To the cases already mentioned, we may add the practice of praying towards the East, for which ORIGEN (In Num. hom. 5. ii. 284) the author of the “*Quest. et Resp. ad Orthod.*” (Inter Just. op. resp. 118.) and the author of the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. ii. c. 57.) contend as an Apostolical tradition; but which Leo, so far from considering such, absolutely disapproves of. (LEON. Serm. 7. de Christi nativ. c. 4.) This is noticed by the Benedictines themselves in a note on Origen, as quoted above.

² See vol. i. pp. 326 and 433.

*a Scriptural command concerning this, it is manifest that, even with respect to this matter, the Apostles committed it to the opinion and choice of each individual."*¹

We have here, then, sufficient testimony to show us that the view for which we contend, has good and able witnesses in its behalf among the early Fathers.

Nor can I pass on without reminding the reader of the remarkable passage already quoted from

GREGORY OF NYSSA (fl. a. 370.)

in which he puts forward the Rule of Scripture as our guide in matters of practice, in a way which is totally inconsistent with the views of our opponents.²

Still further we may observe, *secondly*, that of those who appear in some parts of their writings to take the opposite view, some have elsewhere so modified their testimony as to leave it upon the whole but little different, to all practical purposes, to that of the former.

Such is the case, certainly, with

JEROME (fl. a. 378.)

"As to your inquiry," he says, "respecting the Sabbath, whether we ought to fast on it; and respecting the Eucharist, whether it is to be received daily, a practice the Church of Rome and that of Spain are reported to observe, Hippolytus, a most eloquent man, has also written But I think that you should be briefly admonished that ecclesiastical traditions, especially those which do not affect the faith, are so to be observed as they are delivered by our ancestors; *and that the custom of some is not to be overthrown by the contrary custom of others*

¹ ΑΛΛ' οὐδεις μὲν τούτων ἐγγράφον ἔχει παρασχεῖν τὴν περὶ τούτων ἀποδείξιν. ὅτι μὲντοι ἐκ συνήθειας τίνος μάλλον κατὰ χώρας ἐπιτελεῖται τοῦ Πάσχα ἑορτῇ, ἐκείθεν τεκμαιρομαι Καὶ ἐπειδὴ οὐδεις περὶ τούτου ἐγγράφον ἔχει δεῖξαι παραγγέλμα, ὅλον ὡς καὶ περὶ τούτου τῇ ἑκάστου γνώμῃ καὶ προαίρεσει ἐπέτρεψαν οἱ Ἀποστολοὶ. SOCRAT. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 22. (Ed. Reading. vol. ii. pp. 294, 5.) See the whole passage more fully quoted, vol. i. pp. 327—9.

² See p. 406 above.

. . . but let every province abound in its own views, and esteem the precepts of its ancestors to be Apostolical laws.”¹

This passage, I suspect, furnishes us with a key to the whole matter. In points of ecclesiastical order which did not affect the faith, it was on many accounts desirable that the scruples or perverseness of individuals, should not interfere with matters that had been sanctioned by long usage in the Church, the peace of the Church being thereby greatly endangered. Therefore, says Jerome, let each province follow the customs which have long obtained in it, even though they may be contrary to what are observed in other provinces; and let each look upon such customs as Apostolical laws. Where the apostolicity of such matters is evidently not insisted upon as what could be strictly proved, but which, for the sake of the peace of the Church, might, *in a general sense*, be allowed, where no evil could arise to the faith from the admission. To the sentiments of Jerome, as here expressed, we are far from being desirous of offering any objection; but, on the contrary, believe that there was much good sense in the advice. And I suspect that many of the Fathers, when they spoke of Apostolical traditions in such matters, took the same view of the subject.

That such, or very similar, was also the view of

AUGUSTINE (Æ. a. 396.)

is, I think, evident on a review and comparison of various passages in his works. For though, when writing on the question of the rebaptization of those baptized by heretics, he says, “Many things which are not found in the writings of the Apostles, nor in the Councils of those

¹ De Sabbatho quod queris, utrum jejunandum sit; et de Eucharistia, an accipienda quotidie, quod Romana Ecclesia et Hispaniæ observare perhibentur, scripsit quidem et Hippolytus vir disertissimus, et carptim diversi Scriptores e variis auctoribus edidere. Sed ego illud breviter te admonendum puto, traditiones ecclesiasticas (præsertim quæ fidei non officiant) ita observandas, ut a majoribus traditæ sunt; nec aliorum consuetudinem aliorum contrario more subverti sed unaquæque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et præcepta majorum leges Apostolicas arbitretur. HIERON. Epist. ad Lucin. ep. 71. *ad fin.* Op. tom. i. col. 434, 5.

who came after them ; yet, inasmuch as they are observed throughout the Universal Church, are believed to have been delivered and commended to observation, by no others than by them ;”¹ and that “ that which the Universal Church holds, and was not instituted by Councils, but always preserved, is most rightly believed to have been delivered by no other than Apostolical authority ;”² yet, nevertheless, as Bishop Taylor says, “ It seems himself was not sure that so little a foundation could carry so big a weight ; he therefore plainly hath recourse to Scripture in this question ; ‘ Whether is more pernicious, not to be baptized, or to be re-baptized, is *hard to judge* ; nevertheless, having recourse to the standard of our Lord, where the monuments of this are not estimated by human sense, but by divine authority, I find concerning each of them the sentence of our Lord,’ (Contr. Don. lib. iv. c. 14, &c. 17 and 24), to wit, in the Scriptures.”³ And so, still more strongly in another passage, Augustine says, “ Lest I should seem to treat the matter with *human arguments*, since the *obscurity of this question* drove great men, in former times of the Church, before the schism of Donatus, and men endued with much Christian charity, episcopal Fathers, to differ from one another, &c. . . . I produce *from the Gospel* certain proofs, by which, the Lord helping me, I prove how rightly and truly, according to the Divine will, it has been ordained,” &c.⁴ And so far is he from disapproving of Cyprian’s reference to Scripture in the question, that he says,—“ But what Cyprian advises, namely, that we must go back to the fountain head, that is, to Apostolical tradition,—and thence direct the stream to our own times, is the best,

¹ Multa quæ non inveniuntur in litteris eorum [i. e. Apostolorum], neque in conciliis posteriorum, et tamen quia per universam custodiuntur Ecclesiam, non nisi ab ipsis tradita et commendata creduntur. De bapt. contra Donat. lib. ii. c. 7. ix. col. 102.

² Quod universa tenet Ecclesia nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate Apostolica traditum rectissime creditur. Ib. lib. iv. c. 24. ix. 140.

³ Works, vol. x. p. 433, 434.

⁴ De bapt. contra Donat. lib. i. c. 7. tom. ix. col. 84. See vol. i. p. 340.

and without doubt to be done. It is, therefore, delivered to us, as he himself relates, by the Apostles, that there is one God, and one Christ, and one hope, &c. [Eph. iv. 4.]¹ And he says, "That which the custom of the Church hath ever held, that which this disputation cannot disincline us to, and that which a General Council has confirmed, that we follow. Add to this, that the reasons and *testimonies of Scripture* adduced on both sides having been well weighed, it may *also* be said, *That which truth has declared*, that we follow."² It seems, then, that after all, the burthen of proof, as to the Apostolicity of the custom, was thrown by him upon Scripture; which shows the misgivings of his mind as to the sufficiency of the other evidence.

And this view of his sentiments seems to me strongly confirmed by a remark he makes in his Letter to Casulanus, where, on the question of fasting on the Sabbath, he says, "In these things in which the divine Scripture has determined nothing certain, the custom of the people of God, or the institutes of our ancestors, are to be considered as a law."³ Here it is evident that, for matters of this kind not determined in Scripture, he claims *no other* sanction than that which long *ecclesiastical* usage gives them; and such usage he justly thinks that *individuals* should reckon equivalent to a law. Upon the whole, then, his view seems to differ but little, if at all, practically from that which we maintain. There are no references

¹ Quod autem nos admonet, ut ad fontem recurramus, id est, ad Apostolicam traditionem, et inde canalem in nostra tempora dirigamus, optimum est, et sine dubitatione faciendum. Traditum est ergo nobis, sicut ipse commemorat, ab Apostolis, quod sit unus Deus et Christus unus, &c. [Eph. iv. 4.] De bapt. contra Don. lib. v. c. 26. ix. 158.

² Quod Ecclesiæ consuetudo semper tenuit, quod hæc disputatio dissuadere non potuit, et quod plenarium concilium confirmavit, hoc sequimur. Huc accedit, quod bene perspectis ex utroque latere disputationis rationibus et Scripturarum testimoniis, potest etiam dici, Quod veritas declaravit, hoc sequimur. De bapt. contra Don. lib. iv. c. 6. ix. 126.

³ In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura divina, mos populi Dei vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt. Epist. ad Casulan. ep. 36 (al. 85.) § 2. ii. 68.

to be found in Augustine to "precious Apostolical relics," demanding "the same reverence" from us as the written Word.

Finally, we must remark that, even were the testimony of these Fathers different to what it is, our opponents, both Romanists and Tractators, could not consistently maintain that such (supposed) Apostolical traditions are obligatory on the Church, because they do not themselves adopt them all.

I have already given some proofs of this;¹ and more might easily be added, as will hardly, I suppose, be denied. I will not, therefore, detain the reader by enumerating other instances. But it clearly follows from hence, either that they do not consider patristical testimony sufficient to prove the Apostolical origin of these practices, which is in direct contradiction to their professed theory, or that they hold that, even if they were of Apostolical origin, the Church, or any independent portion of it, has power to deviate from them; which *practically* leaves the matter much in the same state as the view for which we contend. We do not deny the possibility that some of the rites now in use in the Church, of those not mentioned in Scripture, may have had Apostolical sanction for their introduction, as for instance the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, though we believe that we have no sufficient evidence to *prove* the Apostolicity of any of them; and we hold that the Church, or each independent Church, has the power of ordering such matters according to its own discretion, and that individuals ought, for the sake of the peace of the Church, to acquiesce in its decisions. The advice, therefore, of Jerome, that individuals should, in such matters, look upon the customs of their Church that have come down to them from of old as equivalent to Apostolical usages, and the similar advice of Augustine, appear to us to have in their due place, and within

¹ See vol. i. pp. 421, 2.

their due limits, much practical wisdom. And it would, perhaps, have been well for the Church, if the remark of Gregory the Great had been more borne in mind by all parties, that "while the faith is one and the same, a difference of customs is no injury to the Church."¹ If, then, any man chooses to contend for the Apostolicity of any particular practice or practices sanctioned by very early and general ecclesiastical usage, but at the same time allows that these things are left to the discretion of each independent Church, the practical result is much the same as in the former view of the matter. But if we are bound, as our opponents seem to think, to observe all those practices that had Apostolical sanction for their observance in the primitive Church, and the testimony of a few of the early Fathers is held sufficient to prove that sanction; or even if we are only required to observe those that are said to have been delivered by the Apostles as of permanent obligation, and the testimony of a few Fathers is held sufficient to show such a delivery; then if we receive one that pleases us upon a certain amount of testimony, we must not reject another which has equally good testimony in its favour, because we are disinclined to it; and if we do, we are self-condemned; which we humbly submit is the case with the Tractators.

SECTION V.—WHETHER SCRIPTURE IS SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR TO TEACH THE FAITH; AND HOW ITS MEANING IS BEST ASCERTAINED.

WE proceed to the question of the alleged *obscurity* of Scripture; and the reader will probably have already observed, that many of the passages cited in a former section in proof of Scripture being our sole and complete Rule of faith, equally show that the writers held that it

¹ In una fide nihil officit sanctæ Ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa. GREGOR. M. Ep. ad Leandr. Epist. lib. i. 43.; ii. 532. ed. Ben.

was a Rule perspicuous enough for the guidance and instruction of mankind at large.

But we have testimonies in abundance of a more direct kind, to some of which (as the question is of primary importance in the present controversy) I shall now call the reader's attention.

I begin with,—

JUSTIN MARTYR. (fl. a. 140.)

Who says, in his Conference with Trypho and his companions, "Attend, therefore, to what I am about to call to your remembrance from the Holy Scriptures, which [Scriptures] do not need to be interpreted, but only to be heard."¹ And this is spoken with respect to those passages which prove the divinity of our Saviour; and in the context the true reason is given why, though they were so plain that no one could reasonably say anything against them, the Jews did not understand them, viz. that because of their wickedness God had withheld from them the power to understand what was revealed in his word; which, and not any obscurity in them, is still the true reason for their being misunderstood; and he who charges God's word with obscurity, because men of perverse minds misinterpret it, dishonours God, and deceives mankind.

Again; "For it is ridiculous for any one to see the sun and the moon, and the other heavenly bodies, following always the same course, and yet to make a change in his mode of reckoning the seasons; and that an arithmetician, if asked how many twice two make, because he had often said that they make four, should no longer reply that they make four, &c. . . . or, in like manner, that one who is discoursing from the prophetic Scriptures should pass over those Scriptures, and not always

¹ Προσεχετε τοιγαρον οίσπερ μελλω αναμνησκειν απο των ἁγιων γραφων ουδε εξηγηθηναι δεομενων, αλλα μονον ακουσθηναι. JUST. MART. Dial. cum Tryph. § 55. p. 150. ed. Ben. (Ed. Col. p. 274.)

bring forward the same Scriptures, but *think that he himself can produce something better than the Scripture.*"¹ From which we see that he considered no language so fitted to teach the truth as that of Scripture.

These passages, though we shall meet with many still more direct and full in many other Fathers, are such as clearly indicate the bearing of Justin's views upon these points.

Further, it is not tradition, but *the gift of spiritual discernment*, to which, according to Justin, we must look, to enable us to understand the mind of the Scriptures. "If, therefore," he says, "any one should not, by the great grace which comes from God, have received power to understand what has been spoken and done by the prophets, it will avail him nothing to seem to speak of their words or acts, if he cannot give any account of them."² And again, still more clearly,—“Do you think, therefore, O men, that we could ever have understood these things in the Scriptures, unless, through the will of him who willed them, we had received grace to understand them?”³

It is not, then, to tradition, but to Divine grace, the influence of the Spirit received *individually*, to which Justin Martyr would lead us as the interpreter of the Scriptures.

¹ Γελοιον μιν γαρ πραγμα εστιν δραν τον ηλιον και την σεληνην και τα αλλα αστρα την αυτην οδον αι, και τας τροπας των ωρων ποιεισθαι, και τον ψηφιστικον ανδρα, ει εξεταζοιτο τα δις δυο ποσα εστι, δια το πολλakis ειρηκεναι οτι τεσσαρα. πωσσεσθαι του παλιν λεγειν οτι τεσσαρα, και τα αλλα ομοιως οσα παγιως ομολογειται, αι ωσαντως λεγεσθαι και ομολογεισθαι· τον δε απο των γραφων των προφητικων ομιλιας ποιουμενον εαν, και μη τας αυτας αι λεγειν γραφας, αλλ' ηγεισθαι εαυτον βελτιον της γραφης γεννησαντα ειπειν. Id. ib. § 85. p. 182. (Ed. Col. p. 311, 12.)

² Ει ουν τις μη μετα μεγαλης χαριτος της παρα Θεου λαβοι νοησαι τα ειρημενα και γεγεννημενα υπο των προφητων, ουδεν αυτον ονησει το τας βησεις δοκειν λεγειν, η τα γεγεννημενα, ει μη λογον εχει και περι αυτων αποδιδοναι. Id. ib. § 92. p. 189. (Ed. Col. p. 319.)

³ Οιεσθε ουν ημας ποτε, ω ανδρες, νενοηκεναι δυνηθηναι εν ταις γραφαις ταυτα, ει μη θεληματι του θελησαντος αυτα ελαβομεν χαριν του νοησαι; Id. ib. § 119. p. 211. (Ed. Col. p. 346.)

I pass on to,—

IRENÆUS. (fl. a. 167.)

“A sound mind,” says Irenæus, “and one that is not rash, but cautious, and a lover of truth, will earnestly search out whatever things God has placed within the power of man, and subjected to our comprehension, and will advance in the knowledge of them, making the knowledge of them easy to itself by daily study. But these things are those that fall under our sight, and *as many things as are declared clearly and unambiguously in express terms in the divine Scriptures*. And therefore *the parables* [i.e. those things that are mystically expressed] *ought to be explained suitably to those parts that are unambiguous*, for thus both he who explains, explains without danger, and the parables receive a like explanation from all. . . . But it is foolish to apply those things which are spoken obscurely, and not placed before our eyes, to explanations of the parables, which each one makes out to mean what he pleases; for thus no one will possess the rule of truth, but there will appear to be as many truths opposed to each other, and establishing contrary doctrines, as there are interpreters of the parables, as is the case with the questions of the Gentile Philosophers. So that, according to this method of proceeding, a man may be always seeking and never find the truth, because he has rejected the proper method for discovering it. . . . Since, therefore, all the Scriptures, both Prophetic and Evangelic, may be heard by all, (*though all do not believe*,) *openly and unambiguously and alike proclaiming* that the one and only God, to the exclusion of others, made all things by his Word, whether they be visible or invisible, or heavenly or earthly, or marine or subterranean, *as we have demonstrated from the very words of Scripture*; that very created system in which we are bearing witness by those things which are seen, to this fact, that there is one Being who made and governs it; they will appear very dull who blind their eyes to so

clear a manifestation of the truth, and are unwilling to see the light of that which is thus proclaimed Since the parables can receive many explanations, who that loves the truth will not confess, that to affirm anything from *them* respecting our inquiry after God, leaving what is *certain and beyond doubt* and true, is the part of rash and irrational persons. And is not this to build our house, not upon a firm and strong rock, and one situated in an open place, but upon the uncertain foundation of the scattered sand? Whence the overthrow of such a building is easy. *Having, therefore, truth itself as our rule, and the testimony respecting God placed openly before our view*, we ought not to cast away a firm and true knowledge concerning God by interpretations of questions diverging in various directions from the truth But if we cannot find out the explanations of all those things which are sought in the Scriptures we ought to yield such things to God who made us, *knowing well, that the Scriptures are perfect*, as having been spoken by the Word of God and his Spirit; but we, in proportion as we are inferior and far removed from the Word of God and his Spirit, so far do we lack the knowledge of his mysteries. And it is not wonderful if in spiritual and heavenly things, and those things which have to be revealed, we suffer this, since even of those things which are before our feet, I mean the things which are in this created system, which are touched by us and seen, and are with us, many things have escaped our knowledge, and we leave these things to God If, therefore, in this way which we have mentioned, we leave some questions to God, we shall both preserve our faith, and persevere without danger, and all Scripture given to us by God will be found by us harmonious, and the parables will agree with those things which are spoken perspicuously, *and the things spoken perspicuously will explain the parables.*"¹

¹ Ὁ ὄγιος νους καὶ ακινδυνος, καὶ ευλαβης, καὶ φιλαληθης, ὅσα ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐξουσία δέδωκεν ὁ Θεός, καὶ ὑποτεταχέ τῇ ἡμετέρῃ γνώσει, ταῦτα προθυμῶς

I have quoted this passage at length, that the reader may be enabled to judge better of the real force of the testimony contained in it respecting our present subject; and it shows, I hope, very clearly that the views of Ire-

εκμελετησει, και εν αυτοις προκοψει, δια της καθημερινης ασκησεως ραδιαν την μαθησιν εαυτω ποιουνμενος. Εστι δε ταυτα, τα τε υπ' οψιν πιπτοντα την ημετεραν, και οσα φανερωσ και αναμφιβολως αυτολεξει εν ταις θειαις γραφαις λελεκται. Et ideo parabolæ debent non ambiguis adaptari. Sic enim et qui absolvit, sine periculo absolvit, et parabolæ ab omnibus similiter absolutionem accipient. . . . Sed quæ non aperte dicta sunt, neque ante oculos posita, [stultum est, *Grab. conj.*] copulare absolutionibus parabolarum, quas unusquisque prout vult adinvenit. Sic enim apud nullum erit regula veritatis; sed quanti fuerint qui absolverent parabolas, tantæ videbuntur et veritates oppugnantes se invicem, et contraria sibi met dogmata statuantes, sicut et Gentilium philosophorum quæstiones. Itaque secundum hanc rationem, homo quidem semper inquireret, nunquam autem inveniet, eo quod ipsam inventionis abjecerit disciplinam Cum itaque universæ Scripturæ et Prophetiæ et Evangelicæ in aperto et sine ambiguitate et similiter ab omnibus audiri possint, etsi non omnes credunt, unum et solum Deum, ad excludendos alios, prædicent omnia fecisse per Verbum suum, sive visibilia, sive invisibilia, sive cælestia, sive terrena, sive aquatilia, sive subterranea, sicut demonstravimus ex ipsis Scripturarum dictionibus; et ipsa autem creatura in qua sumus, per ea quæ in aspectum veniunt, hoc ipsum testante, unum esse qui eam fecerit et regat: valde hebetes apparebunt, qui ad tam lucidam adaptationem cæcutiunt oculos, et nolunt videre lumen prædicationis Quia autem parabolæ possunt multas recipere absolutiones, ex ipsis de inquisitione Dei affirmare, derelinquentes quod certum et indubitatum et verum est, valde præcipitantium se in periculum et irrationabilium esse, quis non amantium veritatem confitebitur? Et nunquid hoc est non in petra firma et valida et in aperto posita ædificare suam domum, sed in incertum effusæ arenæ? Unde et facilis est eversio hujusmodi ædificationis. Habentes itaque regulam ipsam veritatem, et in aperto positum de Deo testimonium, non debemus per quæstionum declinantes in alias atque alias absolutiones ejicere firmam et veram de Deo scientiam Si autem omnium quæ in Scripturis requiruntur absolutiones non possumus invenire cedere hæc talia debemus Deo, qui et nos fecit, rectissime scientes, quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ; nos autem secundum quod minores sumus et novissimi a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus, secundum hoc et scientia mysteriorum ejus indigemus. Et non est mirum, si in spiritalibus et cælestibus et in his quæ habent revelari, hoc patimur nos: quandoquidem etiam eorum quæ ante pedes sunt (dico autem quæ sunt in hac creatura, quæ et contrectantur a nobis, et videntur et sunt nobiscum) multa fugerunt nostram scientiam, et Deo hæc ipsa committimus Ει ουν καθ' ον ειρηκαμεν τροπον, ενια των ζητηματων αναθσωμεν τω Θεω, και την πιστιν ημων διαφυλαξομεν, και ακινδυνοι διαμενουμεν, και πασα γραφη δεδομενη ημιν απο Θεου συμφωνος ημιν ευρεθησεται, και αι παραβολαι τοις διαρρηθην ειρημενοις συμφωνησουσι, και τα φανερωσ ειρημενα επιλυσει τας παραβολας. Ib. ii. 46, 47. pp. 171—4. ed. Grab. (Mass. ii 27, 28. pp. 155—7.)

næus upon this point were very different from those of our opponents. He did not think it at all inconsistent to assert that a thing was clearly and unambiguously laid down in the Scriptures, though all do not believe it; and he tells us that the lover of truth earnestly searches out *what God has placed within his comprehension*, advancing in the knowledge of it by daily study, and that these things are, those things that fall under our sight, and those that are *declared clearly and unambiguously in express terms in the divine Scriptures*, and that *these things thus perspicuously declared are to be our guide in interpreting those parts that are obscure*.

We could ask for nothing more expressly affirming our view.

And, as we have already seen, he reproves those who, when they are convicted of error by the Scriptures, find fault with the Scriptures "as if they were *ambiguous*, and as if the truth could not be found out from them by those who are ignorant of tradition,"¹ a testimony opposing, *in terms*, the view advanced by our opponents, for this is the very proposition which they maintain, viz. that the truth cannot be found out from the Scriptures by those who are ignorant of tradition.

Again, speaking of the four Gospels, he tells us that they "breathe all around them immortality, and *give life to men*."² So he tells us that the "doctrine of the Apostles and their disciples [i. e. Mark and Luke whom he had been quoting] concerning God is made *clear by their words*."³ Our opponents tell us that we are not to *learn* doctrine from the Scriptures, but only to go to them for what they call *proof*, but Irenæus learned doctrine from Scripture.⁴ And when delivering his doctrine respecting

¹ See p. 279 above.

² Undique flantes incorruptibilitatem et vivificantes homines. Ib. iii. 11. p. 221. (M. ib. p. 190.)

³ Manifesta igitur et Apostolorum et discipulorum eorum ex verbis ipsorum de Deo facta est sententia. Ib. iii. 16. p. 238. (M. iii. 15. p. 204.)

⁴ Sicut ex Scripturis discimus. Ib. ii. 47. p. 175. (M. ii. 28. p. 157.) Didicimus enim ex Scripturis, &c. Ib. ii. 49. p. 177. (M. ii. 28. p. 158.)

God, he tells us, when proceeding to the Scripture proof of its truth, that the Scriptures *much more plainly and clearly* proclaim the doctrine.¹

And, once more, he says,—“The faith which we profess is firm and not imaginary, and alone true, having *manifest* proof from these Scriptures [i. e. the Septuagint version of the *Old Testament*].”² How much more then must the Christian faith have *manifest* proof from *the whole* Scriptures!

THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH. (fl. a. 168.)

The next author to whom I would refer the reader is Theophilus of Antioch, who, in his two books to Autolycus, a heathen, thus speaks of the capability even of the books of the Old Testament to teach the faith. “But if you will, do you also read with attention the prophetical Scriptures, and they themselves will lead you more safely so as to enable you to escape eternal punishment and obtain the eternal blessings of God.”³ Again; “Let it be your object for the future to study with a willing mind the things of God, I mean the things declared by the prophets, that having compared the things spoken by us with those spoken by the rest of mankind, you may be able to find out the truth.”⁴ Again;—“Why should I enumerate a great number of the prophets, who were many, and spoke a multitude of things all agreeing with each other? *For those who will may, by reading the things spoken by them,*

¹ *Ipsis Scripturis multo manifestius et clarius hoc ipsum prædicantibus.* Ib. ii. 66. p. 195. (M. ii. 35. p. 171.) *Utens his ostensionibus quæ sunt ex Scripturis facile evertis, &c.* Ib. v. 14. p. 422. (M. ib. p. 311.)

² *Firma est autem et non ficta et sola vera, quæ secundum nos est fides, manifestam ostensionem habens ex his Scripturis.* Ib. iii. 25. p. 256. (M. iii. 21. p. 216.)

³ *Εἰ δὲ βούλει καὶ σὺ ἐντυχὲ φιλοτιμῶς ταῖς προφητικαῖς γραφαῖς καὶ αὐτὰ σε τρανότερον ὀδηγήσουσι πρὸς τὸ ἐκφυγεῖν τὰς αἰωνίους κόλασεις, καὶ τυχεῖν τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ.* THEOPH. ANTIOCH. *Ad Autol.* lib. i. § ult. Ed. Bened. p. 346. (Ed. Col. p. 79.)

⁴ *Καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστὼ σοὶ φιλοφρονῶς ἐρευνᾶν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, λέγω δὲ τὰ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ῥηθέντα, ὅπως συγκρίνας τὰ τε ὑπο ἡμῶν λεγόμενα, καὶ τὰ ὑπο τῶν λοιπῶν, δυνήσῃ εὐρεῖν τὸ ἀληθές.* Id. ib. lib. ii. § 34. p. 373. (Ed. Col. p. 110.)

know accurately the truth, and not be led astray by vain fancies."¹ Again; "It behoves, therefore, one who desires learning, to be willing to learn. Endeavour, therefore, more frequently to converse with them [i. e. the prophetic writings], that, having heard the living voice, you may *learn accurately the truth.*"²

TERTULLIAN. (fl. a. 192.)

What, again, is Tertullian's view as to the aptitude of Scripture to teach the faith?

The following passages, though bearing indirectly on the point, as one not under discussion, will show his mind respecting it.

Thus in his Treatise on the Resurrection, he says,—
"It is indeed right, as also we have laid down above, that doubtful passages in Scripture should be interpreted by those that are certain, and obscure passages by those that are plain; both to the intent that faith may not be destroyed, the truth endangered, and the Godhead deemed of variable mind, through a disagreement between the certain and the doubtful, the plain and the obscure, as because it is not probable that that article of the Christian religion to which the whole faith is committed, and on which all discipline rests, should seem to be ambiguously announced and obscurely propounded."³ Scripture, then, is in parts plain, and where it is not so, that which is obscure is to be expounded by that which is plain; nor is it probable,

¹ Καὶ τι μοι το πλῆθος καταλεγειν των προφητων πολλων οντων, και μυρια φιλα και συμφωνα ειρηκοτων; οί γαρ βουλομενοι, δυνανται εντυχοντες τοις δι' αυτων ειρημενοις ακριβως γινωαι το αληθες, και μη παραγεσθαι ὑπο διανοιας και ματαιοπονιας. Id. ib. § 35. p. 374. (Ed. Col. p. 112.)

² Χρη ουν τον φιλομαθη και φιλομαθειν' πειρασθητι ουν πυκνοτερον συμβαλειν, ὅπως και ζωσης ακουσας φωνης, ακριβως μαθης ταληθες. Id. ib. § ult. p. 379. (Ed. Col. p. 116.)

³ Et utique æquum sit, quod et super demandavimus, incerta de certis, et obscura de manifestis præjudicari: vel ne inter discordiam certorum et incertorum manifestorum et obscurorum fides dissipetur, veritas periclitetur, ipsa Divinitas ut inconstans denotetur: tum quod verisimile non est, ut ea species sacramenti in quam fides tota committitur, in quam disciplina tota connititur, ambigue annuntiata et obscure proposita videatur. TERTULL. De resurr. carn. c. 21. p. 337.

thinks Tertullian, that an important point of the Christian faith should be propounded obscurely or ambiguously in Scripture.

Again, in the same Treatise, speaking of the heretics, he calls them, "those haters of the light of the Scriptures;" ¹ in which we may observe, by the way, how mistaken our opponents are when they tell us that the Scriptures were the great refuge to which the heretics betook themselves.

And, again, in his Treatise against Praxeas, he says,—
 "Moreover, the Scripture is in no danger that it should need the aid of your argumentation lest it should seem to contradict itself. It speaks with good reason both when it determines that there is one God, and when it shows that the Father and Son are two, and *is self-sufficient*." ²

And in the same Treatise having quoted some passages relating to the distinction of Persons in the Trinity, he appeals to them as *manifestly* setting forth that distinction. ³

And in his Treatise "On Præscription against the heretics," he says that "necessity compelled those who purposed to teach other doctrines to alter the instruments (or documents) containing the doctrine. For otherwise they *could not have taught differently*, unless they had *different documents* by which to teach. As their corruption of doctrine could not have succeeded without the corruption of the documents in which the doctrine is delivered, so integrity of doctrine would not have fallen to our lot without the integrity of those documents by which the doctrine is delivered." ⁴

¹ Lucifugæ isti Scripturarum. Id. ib. c. 47. p. 354.

² Porro non periclitatur Scriptura ut illi de tua argumentatione succurras, ne sibi contraria videatur. Habet rationem et quum unicum Deum statuit et quum duos Patrem et Filium ostendit; et sufficit sibi. Id. Adv. Prax. c. 18. p. 510.

³ His itaque paucis tamen manifeste distinctio Trinitatis exponitur. Id. ib. c. 11. p. 506. See also c. 13. p. 507, and De carne Christi, c. 15. p. 319.

⁴ Quibus fuit propositum aliter docendi, eos necessitas coegit aliter disponendi instrumenta doctrinæ. Alias enim non potuissent aliter docere, nisi

It is evident, then, that he thought that the Scriptures delivered the doctrines of religion *clearly and plainly*, when he tells us that to give any probability to the doctrines of the heretics it was *necessary* that those Scriptures should be *altered*. There were certainly other modes of corrupting the truth, as he himself mentions just after in the case of the Valentinians, who, as he says, did not alter the Scriptures to suit their notions, but excogitated notions which they tried to fix upon the Scriptures, by a perversion of the meaning of the words, and similar artifices; but this does not interfere with the observation we have just quoted, that the only way by which heretics could give *probability* to their notions was by altering the Scriptures; and that observation weighs strongly in behalf of the view for which we are contending.

The same remark indeed is expressed in a passage quoted above, that if heretics are "left to prove their points from the Scriptures alone, they will not be able to stand," for he who thus thought would certainly not have charged the Scriptures with ambiguity or obscurity. In fact, this remark is in direct opposition to the statements of the Tractators, for they tell us that the heretics cannot be clearly refuted by Scripture standing alone, on account of its obscurity.

And as it respects the proper mode of obtaining the sense of Scripture in parts that are obscure, he tells us, in a passage quoted above, that "doubtful passages in Scripture should be interpreted by those that are certain, and obscure passages by those that are plain."¹ And further on in the same Treatise he gives as a rule of interpretation for the point of which he is speaking, and

aliter haberent per quæ docerent. Sicut illis non potuisset succedere corruptela doctrinæ sine corruptela instrumentorum ejus; ita et nobis et a nobis [*et a nobis* not in edd. of Pamelius or Semler] integritas doctrinæ non competisset, sine integritate eorum per quæ doctrina tractatur. *Id. De Præscr.* c. 38. p. 216.

¹ De resurr. carn. c. 21. (just quoted.) The same observation is also made in c. 19 of the same Treatise, "Manifestiora quæque prævaleant, et de incertis certiora præscribant." p. 336.

therefore I suppose for others in like manner, that "the sense is to be governed by the subject matter;"¹ a practical direction which shows that he was not disposed to make traditive interpretation the test of truth. And so again, in his Treatise against Praxeas, he says, that instead of doing as the heretics do, who lay hold of a few passages and interpret them in opposition to a multitude of other passages, we ought to interpret the fewer passages by the greater in number.² These are practical directions, which, though not in themselves conclusive, yet show the bearing of the writer's mind, especially when taken in connexion with his own method of obtaining the sense of Scripture as evinced in his various Treatises.

Let us pass on to,—

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. (fl. a. 192.)

As to the perspicuity of Scripture and its aptness to teach the faith, (with the exception, of course, of the mysticisms of his "Gnostic tradition,") he speaks thus;—

"The divine oracles exhibiting to us *most clearly* the way to true religion, lay the foundations of the truth; and the divine Scriptures and wise institutions compendiously lead to salvation; destitute of ornament and external beauty of language, and words suited to captivate and allure, they rouse man suffocated by vice; strengthening us against the evils incident to human life, by one and the same word serving many purposes, turning us on the one hand from the delusion that would be injurious to us, and on the other clearly exhorting us to the salvation set before us."³

¹ Ex materia dicti dirigendus est sensus. De resurr. carn. c. 38. p. 347.

² His tribus capitulis totum instrumentum utriusque Testamenti volunt cedere, cum oporteat secundum plura intelligi pauciora. Sed proprium hoc est omnium hæreticorum. Nam quia pauca sunt quæ in silva inveniri possunt, pauca adversus plura defendunt, et posteriora adversus priora suscipiunt. Adv. Prax. c. 20. p. 511.

³ 'Οι χρησμοί, τὰς εἰς τὴν θεοσεβειαν ἡμῖν ἀφορμὰς ἐναργεστάτα προτεινόντες, θεμελιονοῦσι τὴν ἀληθειαν· γράφαι δὲ αἱ θεαί, καὶ πολιτεῖαι σωφρονεῖς, συντομοὶ σωτηρίας ὁδοί· γυμναὶ κομμωτικῆς, καὶ τῆς ἐκτὸς καλλιφωνίας, καὶ στωμυλίας, καὶ κολακείας ὑπαρχούσαι, ἀνίστωσιν ἀγχομένον ὑποκακίας τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὑπεριδούσαι

Again ; “ The Apostle, knowing this doctrine to be truly divine, says, ‘ Thou, O Timothy, from a babe hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith in Christ.’ For those Scriptures are truly holy which *make men holy and even divine*. The same Apostle consequently calls the writings or volumes composed of these sacred words and syllables, ‘ divinely inspired, profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work.’ ” ¹

Again ; “ Hear ye who are afar off, hear ye who are near ; the word has not been concealed from any ; it is a common light, and shines upon all men. No one is in darkness who knows the word. Let us hasten to obtain salvation, &c. ; ” where, though there may be a difference of opinion on the point, the context seems to me to show that by the word he means the Scripture rather than the Logos.²

Again, he says, — “ On this account the Scriptures were translated into the language of the heathen, *that they might never be able to put forward the plea of ignorance*, having it in their power to hear the truths of Christianity, if only they are willing. Truth interprets itself differently to what any man says respecting truth.” ³

τον ολισθον τον βιωτικον, μια και τη αυτη φωνη πολλα θεραπευνουσαι, αποτρεπουσαι μεν ημας της επιζημιου απατης, προτρεπουσαι δε εμφανως εις προυπτον σωτηριαν. CLEM. ALEX. Cohort. ad Gent. pp. 65, 6. ed. Pott. (Sylb. 50.)

¹ Ταυτην Αποστολος την διδασκαλιαν, θειαν οντως επισταμενος, Σν δε, ω Τιμοθεε, φησιν, απο βρεφους τα ιερα γραμματα οιδας, τα δυναμενα σε σοφισαι εις σωτηριαν, δια πιστεως εν Χριστω· ιερα γαρ ως αληθως, τα ιεροποιουντα και θεοποιουντα γραμματα· εξ ων γραμματων και συλλαβων των ιερων τας συγκειμενας γραφας, τα συνταγματα, δ αυτος ακολουθως Αποστολος θεοπνευστους καλει, ωφελιμους ουσας προς διδασκαλιαν, προς ελεγχον, προς επανορθωσιν, προς παιδειαν την εν δικαιοσυνη· ινα αρτιος η δ του Θεου ανθρωπος, προς παν εργον αγαθον εξηρισμενος. Id. Cohort. ad Gent. p. 71 (or, 56).

² Ακουσατε ουν οι μακραν, ακουσατε οι εγγυς· ουκ απεκρυβη τινας δ Λογος· φως εστι κοινον, επιλαμπει πασιν ανθρωποις· ουδεις Κιμμεριος εν Λογω· σπευσωμεν εις σωτηριαν, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. p. 72 (or, 56).

³ Δια τουτο γαρ Ελληνων φωνη ερμηνευθησαν αι Γραφαι, ως μη προφασιν

Again; "The Prophets have spoken to us according as we who are bound by the flesh are able to hear, *the Lord accommodating himself to the infirmity of men with a view to their salvation.*"¹

Again, referring to the "Shepherd" of Hermas, he says, that an observation of Hermas, that he had written the book given to him in a vision according to the letters, not knowing how to form the syllables, was intended to signify, "that the Scripture was *clear to all* taken according to the mere words, *and that faith in it in that signification possessed the elements of the truth*, and therefore it was allegorically called *the literal reading*; but we hold that the Gnostic exposition of the Scriptures, when faith advances, is likened to *the syllabical reading.*"²

And hence he says, in a passage quoted above, that "*they who have tasted the Scriptures only are believers.*"

From which passages it is evident that he considered that the Scriptures alone were adapted to give at least sufficient instruction in the faith to make men good Christians, though he supposed them to need the impartation of his Gnostic tradition to lead them on to perfection, for "the Gnostic only," he tells us, "can understand and explain those things which are spoken obscurely by the Spirit."³

And with respect to the obscurities of Scripture, he says that the Scriptures conceal their meaning on several

αγνοιας προβαλλεσθαι δυνηθηναι ποτε αυτους, οίους τε οντας επακουσαι και των παρ' ημιν, ην μονον εβελησωσιν. Αλλως τις περι αληθειας λεγει, αλλως η αληθεια εαυτην ερμηνευει. Id. Strom. lib. i. p. 338 (or, 288.)

¹ Ως οίον τε ην επαειν ημας σαρκι πεπεδημενους, οτως ημιν ελαλησαν οι προφηται, συμπεριφερομενου σωτηριως τη των ανθρωπων ασθενεια του Κυριου. Id. Strom. lib. ii. p. 467 (or, 391). See also lib. vi. p. 770 (or, 644.)

² Εδηλον δ' αρα την μεν γραφην προδηλον ειναι πασι, κατα την ψιλην αναγνωσιν εκλαμβανομενην και ταυτην ειναι την πιστιν στοιχειων ταξιν εχουσαν δι' ο και η προς το γραμμα αναγνωσις αλληγορειται την διαπτυξιν δε την γνωστικην των γραφων, προκοπτουσης ηδη της πιστεως εικαζεσθαι τη κατα τας συλλabas αναγνωσει εκδεχομεθα. Id. Strom. lib. vi. p. 806 (or, 679.)

³ Μονον δυνασθαι τον γνωστικον τα επικεκρυμμενws προς του Πνευματος ειρημενα νοησειν τε και διασαφησειν. Id. Strom. lib. vi. p. 798 (or, 671.)

accounts; first, that we may be diligent seekers and always on the watch to find out the words of salvation; moreover, it was not fit that all should know the meaning, lest, receiving what was savingly spoken by the Holy Spirit otherwise than was intended, they might be injured. Wherefore the holy mysteries of the prophecies preserved for the elect, and those who are through faith admitted to knowledge, are veiled in parables.”¹

And, with the exception of his Gnostic tradition, he makes Scripture the interpreter of Scripture. Thus, in passages quoted above, he says, “We, giving perfect proof respecting the Scriptures from the Scriptures themselves, persuade through faith demonstratively;” and again;—“The truth is found . . . *by confirming each of the things demonstrated by the Scriptures from like Scriptures.*”²

And he tells us that the Scriptures are to be expounded according to *the ecclesiastical rule*, (which he calls just before *the rule of truth*,) and that the “ecclesiastical rule is the consent and harmony of the Law and the Prophets with the Covenant (or, Testament) delivered by the advent of our Lord.”³

And hence he speaks elsewhere of those who “explain the truth by showing the harmony of the Covenants (or, Testaments).”⁴

By which, and other passages,⁵ it is evident how much Clement attributed to the interpretation of Scripture by itself.

¹ Δια πολλας τοιουν αιτιας επικρυπτονται τον νουν αι γραφαι· πρωτον μεν, ινα ζητητικοι υπαρχωμεν, και προσαγρυπνωμεν αι τη των σωτηριων λογων ευρεσει· επειτα, μηδε τοις απασι προσηκον ην νοειν ως μη βλαβειεν ετερως εκδεξαμενοι τα υπο του αγιου Πνευματος σωτηριως ειρημενα· διο δη τοις εκλεκτοις των ανθρωπων, τοις τε εκ πιστεως εις γνωσιν εγκριτοις τηρουμενα τα αγια των προφητειων μυστηρια ταις παραβολαις εγκαλυπτεται. *Id. Strom. lib. vi. p. 803 (or, 676, 7).*

² See p. 307 above.

³ Κανων δε εκκλησιαστικος, η συναδια και η συμφωνια νομον τε και προφηταν τη κατα την του Κυριου παρουσιαν παραδιδομενη διαθηκη. *Id. ib. p. 803 (or, 676.)*

⁴ Την αληθειαν δια της ακολουθιας των διαθηκων σαφηνιζοντες. *Id. Strom. lib. vii. p. 894 (or, 760.)*

⁵ See *Strom. lib. vi. p. 781 (or, 656)*, and *lib. vii. p. 896 (or, 762, 3)*.

ORIGEN (fl. a. 230.)

I proceed to Origen, who, in his work against Celsus, says that as a Greek, if he wished to teach the Egyptians or Syrians, would in the first place learn their language, and rather speak imperfectly like a foreigner in that language that he might do some good to his hearers, than by speaking Greek do them no good, "so the Divine Nature, making provision for not those only who are esteemed learned among the Greeks, but the rest also, condescended to the ignorance of the multitude of hearers; in order that, by using phrases to which they were accustomed, it might allure the ignorant multitude to give audience, who might, after an introduction had once been given, be *easily* able to press forward to the comprehension of the deeper of those hidden senses that are in the Scriptures. For to any one reading them it is evident that they have a much deeper meaning to those who give themselves to the investigation of the word than that which appears on the surface, and which is made manifest *in proportion to the study given to the word*, and according to the exercise of his willingness to receive it." ¹

"If you shall at any time see a mind intelligent, quick, and prompt, not contemplating the oracles of God, know that it is not from blindness that it sees not those things that are contained in the Scriptures, not because it is in the dark, but *because it shuts its eyes*." ²

¹ 'Οὕτως ἡ προνοουμένη θεία φύσις οὐ τῶν πεπαιδευθῆαι νομιζομένων μόνον τα [τῶν] Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἑλλήνων, συγκάτεβη τῇ ιδιωτεῖα τοῦ πληθοῦς τῶν ἀκρωμένων ἵνα ταῖς συνηθεῖσιν αὐτοῖς χρησαμένη λέξεσι προκαλεσθῇ ἐπὶ ἀκροασίν τοις ιδιωτῶν πληθος, δυναμένον ἐξ ευχεροῦς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαξ γενομένην εἰσαγωγὴν φιλοτιμησασθαι πρὸς τὸ καὶ βαθύτερα τῶν κεκρυμμένων νοσημάτων ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς καταλαβεῖν. Καὶ τῷ τυχεῖν γὰρ δὴλον τὰς ἀναγινωσκόντι, ὅτι πολλὰ βαθύτερον τοῦ αὐτοθεν ἐμφαινόμενου εἶναι δύναται νοῦν τοῖς ἀνατίθεισιν αὐτοῖς τῇ ἐξετάσει τοῦ λόγου, φανερούμενον κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς εἰς τὸν λόγον σχολῆς, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀσκήσιν αὐτοῦ προθυμίας. ORIGEN. Contra Cels. lib. vii. § 60. Op. tom. i. pp. 737, 8. ed. Ben. A similar passage occurs in the same work, lib. vi. § 2. pp. 629, 30.

² Si quando videris ingeniosam ad intelligendum animam et velocem et alacrem, non [? dele non] meditantem eloquia Dei, cognosce quia non propter

And he says that the heterodox, when reading the Scriptures, reap thorns, not from the Scriptures, but from their own imaginations.¹

And he calls the Scripture “a perfect and harmonious instrument of God, producing from various different notes one saving strain to those who are willing to learn, assuaging and counteracting all the power of the evil spirit.”²

And though he holds that there is in general a triple sense in Scripture, yet he distinctly says, that “the multitude of those who faithfully and simply believe, testifies that the Scripture is profitable when interpreted in its first meaning.”³

And he earnestly exhorts all to make the Scripture their daily study.⁴

Moreover, as it regards the means to be used for rightly understanding it, he speaks thus;—

After having spoken of his own knowledge of its meaning having been acquired by a studious and diligent perusal of it, he adds,—“And others also who are willing to search the Scripture, and have understanding, may find out its meaning. It is, indeed, often obscure, but not, as Celsus says, intelligible in nothing. Moreover, it is not in the power of any fool or impostor to make it plain, or turn to his own purpose what is said whithersoever he may please. But it is only he who is

cæcitatem non videt ea quæ continentur in Scripturis, non ob id quia in tenebris sit, sed quia claudit oculos. Id. In Is. hom. 6. § 7. iii. 119.

¹ Μαλιστα δε εστι κατωσησαι επι των ετεροδοξων εντυγχανοντων ταις γραφαις, και ακανθας ουκ απο των γραφων αλλ' απο των ιδιων επινοιων θεριζοντων. Id. In Jerem. hom. 11. § 3. iii. 189.

² Έν γαρ το τελειον οιδε και ήρμoσμενον οργανον του Θεου ειναι πασαν την γραφην, μιαν αποτελουν εκ διαφορων φθογγων σωτηριον τοις μανθανειν εβελουσι φωνην, καταπαουσσαν και κωλονουσαν ενεργειαν πασαν ποιηρου πνευματος. Id. In Matth. fragm. iii. 441.

³ Απο μεν ουν της πρωτης εκδοχης και κατα τουτο ωφελουσης, ότι εστιν ονασθαι, μαρτυρει τα πληθη των γνησιως και άπλουστερον πεπιστευκοτων. Id. De Princ. lib. iv. § 12. i. 169, 170. See also further confirmatory remarks to the same effect, ib. § 14. pp. 171—173, and Contra Cels. lib. iv. § 49. i. 541.

⁴ See In Levit. hom. 9. § 5. ii. 240, and In Genes. hom. 10. § 2. ii. 87.

truly wise in Christ who can unfold the whole order of the things spoken mysteriously in the prophecies, *comparing spiritual things with spiritual, and confirming each of the things found from the phraseology customary in the Scriptures.*"¹

"We take hold of the books and read, but we attain not the spiritual sense. And therefore there is need that with tears and unceasing prayers we should beg that the Lord may open our eyes . . . And why do I say that our eyes should be opened? For Jesus came to open the eyes of the blind. Therefore our eyes *are* opened, and the veil is taken away from the letter of the law. But I fear that we ourselves again shut them in a sleep still more profound, while we watch not in the spiritual understanding, nor are anxious to shake off sleep from our eyes, and contemplate the things that are spiritual."²

"I fear lest, *by our too great carelessness and folly of heart*, the divine volumes are not only veiled to us, but also sealed . . . Whence it is manifest not only that we must *apply with earnestness* to learn the meaning of the sacred Scriptures, but also that we must *supplicate the Lord*, and pray day and night, that the Lamb of the tribe of Judah would come, and taking himself the sealed book, would condescend to open it."³

¹ Καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ, οἱ βουλομένοι ἐξετάζειν τὴν γραφὴν, νοῦν ἔχοντες τὸ γνῶμα αὐτῆς εὑρεῖν ἀνδραίντο· οὐσης πολλὰ χον ἀληθῶς ἀσαφούς μὲν, οὐ μὴν, ὥς φησι Κέλσος, τὸ μὴδεν. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δύναται τις ἀνοήτος ἡ γοῆς ἐξομαλίσαι ἡ ὅπῃ ποτε βουλεται τὸ λεχθέν σφέτερισσασθαι· Μόνος δὲ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κατ' ἀληθειαν ἐν Χριστῷ σοφὸς τὸν εἰρμον πάντα ἀποδῶν αὐτῶν μετ' ἐπικρυψέως εἰρημῶν ἐν ταῖς προφητείαις, πνευματικὰ πνευματικοῖς συγκρινῶν, καὶ κατασκευάζων ἀπὸ τῆς συνηθείας τῶν γραφῶν ἕκαστον τῶν εὑρισκομένων. Id. Contra Cels. lib. vii. § 11. i. 701, 2.

² Tenemus libros et legimus, sed spiritalem sensum non attingimus. Et ideo opus est lachrymis et orationibus indesinentibus postulare, ut Dominus aperiat oculos nostros . . . Et quid dico ut aperiantur oculi nostri? Quia jam aperti sunt. Jesus enim venit aperire oculos cæcorum. Aperti ergo sunt oculi nostri, et de litera legis velamen ablatum est. Sed vereor ne nos ipsi eos somno iterum profundiore claudamus, dum non vigilamus in intellectu spiritali, neque solliciti sumus ut somnum discutiamus ab oculis nostris, et contemplerur quæ spiritalia sunt. Id. In Genes. hom. 7. § 6. ii. 80.

³ Ego autem vereor, ne per nimiam negligentiam et stoliditatem cordis, non solum velata sint nobis divina volumina, sed et signata . . . Unde

“ For the explanation of these things we must not depend upon the strength of the human understanding, but upon supplications and prayers poured forth to God. In which also we need your aid, that God the Father of the Word would give us the word to the opening of our eyes, that we may be able to behold wonderful things out of his law. [Ps. 119. 18.]”¹

“ Let us entreat the Lord, &c. . . . that contemplating in the Holy Spirit the things that are written by the Spirit, and comparing spiritual things with spiritual, we may explain the things that are written, worthily of God, and the Holy Spirit who inspired them.”²

“ Ye ought to know that the things read from the sacred volumes are worthy of having been uttered by the Holy Spirit, but we need the grace of the Holy Spirit to interpret them.”³

“ As Moses heard God, and then brought to the people what he had heard from God, so we need the Holy Spirit to make us acquainted with the mysteries [of Divine truth], that by our prayers we may be enabled to hear the Scripture, and then signify to the people what we have heard.”⁴

ostenditur non solum studium nobis adhibendum esse ad discendas literas sacras, verum et supplicandum Domino, et diebus ac noctibus obsecrandum, ut veniat agnus ex tribu Judæ, et ipse accipiens librum signatum dignetur aperire. *Id.* In *Exod. hom.* 12. § 4. ii. 174.

¹ Ad hæc explananda non humani ingenii viribus nitendum est, sed orationibus, et precibus ad Deum fuis. In quo etiam vestri adjutorio indigemus, ut Deus Pater Verbi det nobis verbum in apertionem oris [? oculi] nostri, ut possimus considerare mirabilia de lege ejus. *Id.* In *Levit. hom.* 6. § 1. ii. 215.

² Oremus Dominum ut nobis etiam ad cætera, quæ ab eo prophetata sunt, intelligenda lucidiores quosque et veritati proximos sensus aperire dignetur, ut in Spiritu Sancto considerantes quæ per Spiritum scripta sunt, et spiritalibus spiritalia comparantes, digne Deo et sancto Spiritu qui hæc inspiravit, quæ scripta sunt explicemus. *Id.* In *Num. hom.* 16. § 9. ii. 334.

³ Scire debetis digna quidem esse sancti Spiritus eloquio quæ leguntur, [i. e. “ sacrorum voluminum ”]; sed ad explananda ea indigemus gratia Spiritus Sancti. *Id.* In *Jos. hom.* 8. § 1. ii. 415.

⁴ Quomodo Moses audiebat Deum, et deinde ea quæ a Deo audierat, proferebat ad populum; sic nos indigemus Spiritu sancto loquente in nobis mysteria, ut orationibus nostris Scripturam possimus audire, et rursum quod audivimus populis intimare. *Id.* In *Ezech. hom.* 7. § 10. iii. 385.

Other similar passages might easily be added.”¹

Hence, then, we clearly see that Origen's view was, not that there were no difficulties in Scripture, (which no one supposes,) not that even in the simplest passages there might not be a latent meaning besides that which was upon the surface, (a notion which, as is well known, he carried to an absurd extreme,) but that even a reception of the first and obvious meaning was sufficient to make a man a believer, and that a diligent study of the Scriptures would unfold even its hidden meanings, and that the great assistant to whom we should look for the interpretation of it is the Holy Spirit. And nowhere does he speak so as to modify this view, except with regard to that summary of the faith we have already noticed, for which he considered himself to have sufficient testimony in the preaching of the Apostolical Churches. Nay, in other points, he expressly tells us, as we have seen, that Christians were, from the beginning,* divided as to the meaning of the sacred books. And how far that summary is of any use against the errors of the present day, is a point we have already considered.

CYPRIAN (fl. a. 248.)

In the preface to his first two books of Scripture Testimonies, addressed to Quirinus, in which he gives a few of the chief passages of Scripture on the principal Christian doctrines, after stating what his work contained, he adds, “If you read these, they will be of use to you for the present in forming the first lineaments of the faith. More strength will be given you, and the understanding of your heart will be more and more vigorous, if you search the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament more fully, and read through all the volumes of the spiritual books. For in this work we have but filled a small vessel from the divine fountains, to send to you as a temporary supply. You will be able to drink more freely, and be more fully

¹ See *De Princ. lib. iv. § 10. i. 167.*

satisfied, if you also approach to the same fountains of divine fulness, and drink from hence as we have.”¹

Is not this a reference to Scripture as the best teacher of the Christian religion?

NOVATIAN (fl. a. 251.)

“The divine Scripture,” says Novatian, “easily refutes and exposes both the frauds and thefts of heretics.”²

GREGORY OF NEOCÆSAREA (fl. a. 254.)

“To those who search the divine oracles,” says Gregory of Neocæsarea, “is unfolded the treasure of the knowledge of God.”³

LACTANTIUS (fl. a. 303.)

“Learned men,” says Lactantius, “accustomed to sweet and polished orations and poems, despise the simple and unadorned language of the divine Scriptures as contemptible Could not, then, God, the maker of the mind and voice and tongue, speak eloquently? Yes, verily, but the Supreme Providence wished those things that are divine to be *clear*, that *all might understand what he himself addressed to all*.”⁴

¹ Quæ legenti tibi interim prosint ad prima fidei lineamenta formanda. Plus roboris tibi dabitur, et magis ac magis intellectus cordis operabitur, scrutanti scripturas veteres ac novas plenius, et universa librorum spiritalium volumina perlegenti. Nam nos nunc de divinis fontibus implevimus modicum, quod tibi interim mitteremus. Bibere uberius et saturari copiosius poteris, si tu quoque ad eodem divinæ plenitudinis fontes nobiscum pariter potaturus accesseris. CYPRIANI Testim. ad Quirinum. Præf. ad libr. i. and ii.

² Scriptura divina hæreticorum et fraudes et furta facile convincit et detegit. NOVATIANI De Trin. c. 19. cum Tertull. Op. ed. 1664. p. 718.

³ Τοις ερευνῶσι τα θεία λόγια ἀνακαλύπτεται ὁ θησαυρὸς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ γνῶσεως. GREGOR. NEOCÆS. (THAUMAT.) In Annunc. Serm. 2. ed. Paris. 1622, p. 19. See the whole context.

⁴ Assueti enim [i. e. homines literati] dulcibus et politis sive orationibus sive carminibus, divinarum literarum simplicem communemque sermonem pro sordido asperrantur. . . . Num igitur Deus et mentis et vocis et linguæ artifex diserte loqui non potest? Imo vero Summa Providentia carere fūco voluit ea quæ divina sunt, ut omnes intelligerent quæ ipse omnibus loquebatur. LACTANT. Div. Instit. Lib. vi. c. 21. (Cant. 1685. p. 339. Par. 1748. vol. 1. p. 496.)

"The divine Scriptures teach us the knowledge of the truth."¹

"This is the principal reason why the holy Scripture is not believed among the wise and learned and the princes of this world, that the prophets have spoken in a common and simple phraseology, *as addressing themselves to the people.*"²

"Since there have existed many heresies, and the people of God have, by the instigations of evil spirits, been divided, the truth is briefly to be settled by us, and placed in its own proper abode; that if any one desires to draw the water of life, he may not be carried away to exhausted lakes that have no supply, but may know *the abundant fountain of God, supplied with which he may enjoy perennial light Some not sufficiently learned in the heavenly writings* have been led astray from the right path, and corrupted the heavenly writings, that they might compose for themselves a new doctrine, destitute of any root and stability."³

ATHANASIUS (fl. a. 326.)

Our next witness is Athanasius, whose views, indeed, on

¹ Nos . . . divinæ literæ ad scientiam veritatis erudiunt. Lib. vii. c. 14. (Cant. 1685. p. 383. Par. 1748. vol. 1. p. 555.)

² Nam hæc in primis causa est, cur apud sapientes et doctos et principes hujus sæculi, Scriptura Sancta fide careat, quod Prophetæ communi ac simplici sermone, ut ad populum, sunt locuti. Lib. v. c. 1. (Cant. 1685. p. 236. Par. 1748. vol. 1. p. 361.)

³ Sed quoniam multæ hæreses extiterunt, et instinctibus dæmonum populus Dei scissus est, determinanda est nobis veritas breviter, et in suo proprio domicilio collocanda; ut si quis aquam vitæ cupiet haurire, non ad detritos lacus deferatur, qui non habent venam, sed uberrimum Dei noverit fontem, quo irrigatus perenni luce potiat. Quidam non satis cælestibus literis eruditi depravati sunt ab itinere recto, et cælestes literas corruperunt, ut novam sibi doctrinam sine ulla radice ac stabilitate componerent. Lib. iv. c. 30. (Cant. 1685. pp. 231, 2. Par. 1748. vol. i. pp. 352, 3.) And to these passages we might add the following,—“Ecce vox de cælo veritatem docens, et nobis sole ipso clarius lumen ostendens.” Lib. iii. c. ult. (Cant. 1685. p. 171. Par. 1748. tom. i. p. 270.) There can be little doubt to what Lactantius here refers, but as the Scriptures are not expressly named, I have not noticed it above.

the point now in question are very clearly shown in some of the passages already quoted from him above ; where he tells us that “ the whole inspired Scripture teaches more clearly and fully than he could,”¹ that “ the representations of the truth derived from the Scriptures are much more exact than those derived from any other source ;”² that the reader of Scripture may “ find from the divine oracles” the Christian faith, “ for the holy and inspired Scriptures are sufficient of themselves for the delivery of the truth ;”³ and that “ the true and pious faith in the Lord is *evident to all*, being known and read out of the divine Scriptures.”⁴

But we may add to these many other similar testimonies.

Thus, after having expounded the faith respecting the person and incarnation of Christ, he says,—“ Accept these remarks from us, treating briefly of the matter as far as regards the elements and outline of the faith with respect to Christ But if, having taken occasion from these remarks, thou shouldest read the Scriptures, sincerely applying thy mind to them, thou shalt know from them, as to the points spoken of, more perfectly and clearly the accuracy of what has been said.”⁵

Again ; “ The Lord himself said, Search the Scriptures, they are they that testify of me. How, therefore, shall they confess the Lord who do not search the Scriptures respecting him ? . . . Of what use are the Scriptures to him of Samosata ? . . . Of what use are the Scriptures to the Arians, and why do they quote them ? For

¹ See p. 361, note ¹ above.

² See p. 362, note ¹ above.

³ See p. 366, note ³ above.

⁴ See p. 370, note ² above.

⁵ Ταῦτα μὲν σοὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν δι’ ὀλίγων, ὅσον πρὸς στοιχειώσιν καὶ χαρακτῆρα τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν πίστεως. Σὺ δὲ τὴν προφασιν ἐκ τούτων λαβὼν, εἰ ἐντυγχάνῃς τοῖς τῶν γραφῶν γραμμασί, γνησίως αὐτοῖς ἐφίστανων τὸν νοῦν, γνῶσιν παρ’ αὐτῶν τὰ λεγόμενα τελειότερον μὲν καὶ τρανότερόν τινος λεχθέντων τὴν ἀκριβείαν. ATHANAS. De incarn. Verbi Dei. § 56. tom. i. p. 96. ed. Ben.

none of these heresies have anything in common with the Scriptures in the impiety of their conceits. And this their patrons well know. . . . But in order to deceive the simple . . . they pretend to care for and speak the words [of Scripture], like their father the devil, that from the use of the words they may seem to hold the right doctrine, and may then persuade miserable men to embrace doctrines contrary to the Scriptures . . . Any one who wished accurately to discuss these points, might write much respecting them . . . But since *the divine Scripture is more competent than all things* [to teach the faith], therefore having given my advice to those who desire to know more concerning these things *to read the divine words*, I have myself hastened to set forth that which is most pressing, on which account chiefly I have thus written.”¹

A more direct and unqualified contradiction to the view of the Tractators than is contained in this passage could not be framed.

Again; “We are confident,” he says, “*from the divine Scriptures*, respecting the orthodox faith, and place it as a light upon a candlestick.”²

“The Scripture hath laid down such examples and images, in order that, since human nature is unable to

¹ Ὁ δὲ Κύριος αὐτὸς ἐλέγεν, ἐρευνάτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι αὐταὶ εἰσὶν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ. Πῶς οὖν ὁμολογήσουσι τὸν Κύριον, μὴ προερευνῶντες τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ γραφάς; Τί τῷ Σάμοσατι τὰ τῶν γραφῶν; . . . Τί δὲ καὶ τοῖς Ἀρειανοῖς αἱ γραφαί, καὶ τί τὰντας οὗτοι προφέρουσιν; . . . Πρὸς μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἰδίαν τῆς ἐπινοίας ἀσεβείαν ἑκάστη τούτων τῶν αἵρεσεων οὐδὲν κοινὸν ἔχει πρὸς τὰς γραφάς· καὶ τοῦτο ἴσασι καὶ οἱ τὰ τούτων πρεσβευόντες, . . . ἀπατῆς δὲ χάριν τῶν ἁπλοустέρων . . . σχηματίζονται μελετᾶν καὶ λέγειν τὰς λέξεις, ὥς ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶν διάβολος, ἵνα ἐκ τῶν λέξεων δοξῶσιν ὀρθὸν ἔχειν καὶ τὸ φρόνημα, καὶ λοιπὸν πείσωσι παρὰ τὰς γραφάς φρονεῖν τοὺς ταλαιπῶρους ἀνθρώπους . . . Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ἂν τις γράψῃεν, εἰ βούλοιτο περὶ τούτων ἐπεξεργασθᾶν. . . . Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡ θεία γραφή πάντων ἐστὶν ἱκανώτερα, τούτου χάριν τοῖς βουλομένοις τὰ πολλὰ περὶ τούτων γίνωσκειν, συμβουλευσας ἐντυγχάνειν τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις, αὐτὸς νῦν τὸ κατεπείγον ἐσπουδάσα δηλῶσαι, διὸ μαλίστα καὶ οὕτως ἐγράψα. *Id. Ep. ad Episc. Ægypti et Lib. (al. Orat. l. contra Arian.) § 4. i. 273, 4.*

² Ἴδου γὰρ ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν παρρησιαζόμεθα περὶ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς πίστεως, καὶ ὥς λυχνοῦν ἐπὶ τῆς λυχνίας τιθεσθαι. *Id. Orat. l. contra Arian. § 9. i. 412.*

comprehend the things of God, we may be able, in some small and imperfect way, as far as is attainable, to know something of them. And as with respect to the existence of a God and a Providence, creation is sufficient to give us this knowledge and we do not require words to learn this from them [i. e. from the things that are made]; but upon hearing the Scriptures believe; in the same way, *the afore-mentioned passages being sufficient with respect to the divinity of the Son*, it is vain, nay, rather, it is the height of madness, to doubt, and heretically to ask, how can the Son be eternal?"¹

Far from supposing that there was any obscurity in Scripture that could be any apology for the Arians, he only blames them for their ignorance and perverse interpretation of such clear declarations of the truth as are to be found there.

"They," he says, "laying down their own impious doctrine as a sort of canon, pervert all the divine oracles so as to make them accord with it, who, while only uttering these things, deserve no other answer than 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.'"²

The reason why the heretics did not confess Christ to be the Son of God in an orthodox sense, was, according to him, their "ignorance of the truth, and *want of acquaintance* with the divine Scriptures."³

¹ Τοιαυτα γαρ τα παραδειγματα και τοιαυτας τας εικονας εθηκεν η γραφη, ιν' επειδαν αδυνατος εστιν η ανθρωπινη φυσις περι Θεου καταλαβειν, καν εκ τουτων ολιγοστως πως και αμυδρως, ως εφικτον εστι, διανοεισθαι δυνηθωμεν. Και ωσπερ περι του ειναι θεον και προνοιαν, αυταρκης η κτισις προς την γνωσιν και ου φωνας απαιτουντες παρ' αυτων μαθηνομεν, αλλ' ακουοντες μεν των γραφων πιστευομεν τον αυτον τροπον περι της του υιου θεοτητος ικανων οντων των προειρημενων ρητων, περιττον, μαλλον δε και μανιας πλεον εστιν αμφιβαλλειν, και αιρετικως πυνθαεσθαι, πως ουν δυναται αιδιως ειναι ο υιος; κ. τ. λ. Id. Orat. 2. contra Arian. § 32. i. 500.

² 'Ως κανονα τινα την ιδιαν ασεβειαν θεμενοι, προς τουτον παντα τα θεια λογια διαστρεφουσιν' οι τινες και μονον αυτα φθεγγομενοι, ουδεν ετερον ακουειν εισιν αξιοι, η, Πλανασθε, μη ειδοτες τας γραφας, μηδε την δυναμιν του Θεου. Id. Orat. 1. contra Arian. § 52. i. 457.

³ Το δε ειναι τουτον του Θεου υιον ουχ ομολογουσιν' εστι δε τουτο της αληθειας αγνωσια, και των θειων γραφων απειρια. Id. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 17. i. 222.

And he says, that "they who call the Arians Christians, are much and greatly deceived, as persons who have neither *read the Scriptures*, nor are at all acquainted with Christianity and the faith in Christ."¹

Lastly, on the style of Scripture phraseology, he says, that "it is the custom of the divine Scripture to deliver and describe things that are above human comprehension in the words of man."² And that "it is the custom of the Scripture to speak in a plain and simple style of phraseology."³

Other passages of a similar nature might easily be added.⁴

And the directions he gives for ascertaining the meaning of Scripture are such as these;—

"This doctrine will be found abundantly contained in the divine oracles by him who *diligently reads them*, and investigates the time, and the persons, and the cause of the things written, and *so reads with judgment and discrimination*. Thus such a one will find out the time of this passage we are now considering, and will understand that the Lord, having existed from eternity, afterwards at the end of times became man, &c."⁵

"It is right, as it behoves us to do in the case of the whole divine Scripture, and as, indeed, is necessary, so

¹ Οἱ τοὺτους [i. e. Ἀρειανούς] καλοῦντες Χριστιανούς, πολὺ καὶ λίαν πλανῶνται, ὥς μὴτε τὰς γραφὰς ἀνεγνώκοτες, μὴτε ὅλως εἰδότες τὸν Χριστιανισμόν καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ πίστιν. ID. Orat. 1. contra Arian. § 1. i. 406.

² Ἔθος γὰρ τῇ θεῇ γραφῇ, ἀνθρωπίνως τὰ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου λαλεῖν καὶ σημναινεῖν. ID. Orat. 4. contra Arian. § 27. i. 638.

³ Ἔθος δὲ τοῦτο τῇ γραφῇ, ἀπεριεργῶς καὶ ἁπλῶς τὰς λέξεις ἐκφραζεῖν. ID. Orat. 4. contra Arian. § 33. i. 642.

⁴ See Orat. 3. contra Arian. § 1. i. 551. A. Ib. § 15. i. 564. B. Epist. 1. ad Serap. § 13. i. 661. E. Ib. § 20. i. 669. B. C. Also Pseudo-Athanas. Disp. cum Ario § 43. says, Αἱ ἁγίαι γραφαὶ πάντα σαφῆ διαλεγονται. Tom. ii. p. 228.

⁵ Τὴν δὲ διανοίαν ταυτὴν εὐρήσει καλῶς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις κειμένην ὁ μὴ παρέρχων ἡγούμενος τὴν ἀναγνώσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα καὶ τὴν χρεῖαν τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐρευνῶν, καὶ οὕτω τὰ ἀναγνώσματα διακρίνων καὶ διανοούμενος. Τὸν μὲν οὖν καιρὸν τοῦ ῥήτου τοῦτου εὐρήσει καὶ γνωσεται ὅτι αἰῶν ὁ Κύριος ὕστερον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων γεγενῆσθαι ἀνθρώπος, κ. τ. λ. ID. De decret. Nic. Syn. § 14. i. 220.

here also, faithfully to ascertain the time of which the Apostle spoke, and the person and the thing on account of which he wrote, that the reader may not, by ignorance of these things, or some other similar matter, err from the true meaning." And having noticed some who had not attended to this, he adds,—“Such, therefore, in truth, having been the case with the enemies of Christ, they have fallen away into grievous heresy. For if they had known both the person and the thing, and the time of the Apostle's words, they would not, by understanding what was spoken of his human nature as applying to his divinity, have madly reached such a height of impiety.”¹

These are the practical directions he gives for ascertaining the meaning of Scripture. And his words clearly show that he considered that it needed only the proper use of these means to discover the sense of Scripture. On all points, then, the testimony of Athanasius is wholly with us.

ANTHONY [fl. a. 330.)

Among others, let us hear the testimony of the pious Anthony respecting the sufficiency of Scripture for teaching the faith. In one of his addresses to the monks who had associated themselves with him, as recorded by Athanasius, he commences by saying,—“THE SCRIPTURES ARE SUFFICIENT TO TEACH US; but it is well for us to exhort one another in the faith, and animate one another by discourse.”²

¹ Δει δέ, ὡς ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς θείας γραφῆς προσηκεῖ ποιεῖν, καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἐστίν, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα, καθ' ὃν εἶπεν ὁ ἀποστόλος καιρὸν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα, διόπερ ἐγράψε, πιστῶς ἐκλαμβάνειν, ἵνα μὴ παραταῦτα ἡ καὶ παρ' ἕτερον τι τούτων ἀγνοῶν ὁ ἀναγινώσκων, ἐξω τῆς ἀληθινῆς διανοίας γενήται. . . . Τοιαῦτα δὲ οὖν καὶ οἱ Χριστομαχοὶ παθόντες, εἰς μύσاران αἵρεσιν ἐκπεπτωκάσιν. Εἰ γὰρ ἐγνώκεισαν τὸ τε πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα, καὶ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ βήτου, οὐκ ἂν τα ἀνθρώπινα εἰς τὸν θεοτητα ἐκλαμβάνοντες τοσούτον ἡσέβουν οἱ ἀφρονες. *Id.* *Orat.* 1. *contra Arian.* §§ 54, 55. i. 458, 9.

² Τας μὲν γραφὰς ἱκανὰς εἶναι πρὸ [πρὸς] διδασκαλίῳ ἡμᾶς δὲ καλὸν παρακαλεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐν τῇ πίστει, καὶ ἀλειφεῖν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις. *ANTON. MON.* *ad Monach.* in *Athanas. Vita Anton.* § 16. *Ed. Ben. Op. Athanas. tom. i.* p. 308. *Ed. Colon. 1686. tom. ii.* p. 461.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM (fl. a. 350.)

I proceed to Cyril of Jerusalem, for whose opinion as to the sufficiency of Scripture for teaching the faith, we may note the following passages.

After having given an account of the principal articles of the Christian faith, as taught by Scripture, proceeding to discuss the remaining elementary points, he says, "But the inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testament teach us these things."¹ And accordingly, in the latter part of the same Lecture, he says,—“Fortify thy soul in every way, attending diligently to fastings, works of charity, and the perusal of the divine oracles, that living the rest of thy time in the flesh with temperance, and in the acknowledgment of the pure doctrines of Christianity, thou mayest enjoy the one salvation of the font.”²

Again;—“Go to the bee, and learn how laborious it is; how, flying from flower to flower of every kind, it produces honey for thy profit; *that thou also thyself, going through the divine Scriptures, may obtain thy own salvation*, and being filled with these divine Scriptures may say, ‘How sweet are thy words unto my taste, sweeter than honey and the honeycomb to my mouth.’”³

Again; “But for the future let us go to the divine Scriptures, and drink waters from our own cisterns, the holy fathers, and from the fountain of our own wells. Let us drink from living water springing up into eternal life.”⁴

¹ Ταυτα δε διδασκουσιν ἡμας αἱ θεοπνευστοι γραφαι της παλαιας τε και καινης διαθηκης. CYRILL. HIEROS. Cat. 4. § 20. p. 63. ed. Milles.

² Παντοιως την σεαυτου ψυχην ασφαλιζου, νηστεiais προσεχων, ελεημοσυναις, και θειων λογιων αναγνωσμασιν, ινα μετα σωφροσυνης και δογματων ευσεβων τον επιλοιπον εν σαρκι βιωσας χρονον της μιας του λουτρου σωτηριας απολαυσης. ID. Cat. 4. § ult. p. 68.

Πορευθητι προς την μελισσαν, και μαθε ὡς εργατις εστι· πως ανθη παντοια περιτρεχουσα, συντιθησι σοι προς ωφελειαν το μελι· ινα και αυτος περιερχομενος τας θειας γραφας, της ἑαυτου σωτηριας περιδραξη, και τουτων εμφορουμενος ειπης, ‘Ὡς γλυκεα τω λαρυγγι μοι τα λογια σου· ὑπερ μελι και κηριον τω στοματι μου. ID. Cat. 9. § 6. p. 121.

⁴ Λοιπον δε εις τας θειας γραφας επανελθωμεν, και πινωμεν υδατα απο ἡμετερων αγγειων, ἁγιων πατερων, και απο ἡμετερων φρεατων πηγης· πινωμεν απο υδατος ζωντος ἄλλομενου εις ζωην αιωνιον, κ. τ. λ. ID. Cat. 16. § 5. p. 228.

Again; “For the time would fail me in my discourse if I wished to speak of the points that remain respecting the Holy Spirit from the fourteen Epistles of Paul, in which, in various ways, and with a fulness that has omitted nothing, and in the fear of God, he has taught us [the faith]. But may it be the office of the power of the Holy Spirit himself to grant to us pardon for the things which we have omitted on account of the shortness of the days, and to infuse into you my hearers a more perfect knowledge of the things omitted; *the studious among you learning these things from a more frequent reading of the divine Scriptures*; and now also from these present catechetical lectures, and from what I have before spoken, having a firmer faith, that is, faith in one God the Father Almighty,” &c.¹

HILARY OF POICTIERS (fl. a. 354.)

“When,” saith Hilary of Poitiers, “after a long night of ignorance, after the ambiguous and uncertain teaching of human opinions, after the various views of different religions, man has long been in error and inquiring respecting God . . . every prudent man having betaken himself *to the Prophets and Apostles* will have obtained the knowledge of the whole law of God, under the mystery of its eternal arrangement.” And having added a brief statement of the faith which is thus learned, he says,—“And then this mystery of piety being received, being placed in the light of knowledge after the night of ignorance, he thus speaks, “Shall not my soul be subject unto God? For from him cometh my salvation, &c. [Ps. lxii. 1, 2.]”²

¹ Επιλείψει γὰρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος, εἰ ἐβουλομην λέγειν τὰ λείποντα περὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκ τῶν Παύλου τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἐπιστολῶν, ἐν αἷς ποικίλως, καὶ ἀνελλιπῶς, καὶ εὐλαβῶς ἐδίδασκεν. Ἔργον δ' ἂν εἴη τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἡμῖν μὲν, ἐφ' οἷς ἐνελλείπομεν, διὰ τοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ὀλίγον δοῦναι συγγνώμην, ὑμῖν δὲ τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς τῶν λειπόντων τελειότεραν ἐνθελαι τὴν γνῶσιν, τῶν σπουδαίων ἐν ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς πυκνότερας τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀναγνώσεως τὰ ταυτὰ μανθανόντων, ἥδη δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν παρουσῶν τούτων κατηχήσεων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν προτερον εἰρημενῶν ἡμῖν βεβαιότεραν τὴν πίστιν ἐχόντων, τῶν [? τῆν] εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, κ. τ. λ. Id. Cat. 17. § 16. p. 257.

² Cum post multam inscientiæ noctem, post ambiguam humanarum senten-

“We must first act according to the commands of God ; then his ways are to be considered ; for unless the practice of faithful works shall have gone before, the knowledge of doctrine will not be attained ; and we must first act obediently that we may obtain knowledge. His ‘ways,’ therefore, we consider to mean, according to our former exposition, the Law, the Prophets, all the Gospels and the Apostles [i. e. the books of the Old and New Testament].”¹

“Salvation is far from the wicked, because they have not sought the statutes of God ; since *for no other purpose were they consigned to writing than that they should come within the knowledge and conceptions of all without exception.*”²

“The word of God [speaking expressly of *Scripture*] has consulted the benefit of all who shall ever live, being itself *the best adapted to promote the instruction of mankind in every age.*”³

“The only-begotten God, conscious of his own nature, declares the ineffable mystery of his nativity, for the confession of our faith, *with the greatest possible fulness that words would admit of*, that he might be understood to be born, and yet believed to be in the nature of God.”⁴

tiarum incertamque doctrinam, post diversarum religionum variam opinionem, cum diu erratum quæsitumque de Deo sit prudens quisque conversus ad Prophetas atque Apostolos, Dei legem omnem sub sacramento æternæ dispositionis perceperit ac tum hoc sacramento pietatis accepto post ignorationis noctem in scientiæ lumine collocatus ita dicit, etc. HILAR. PICTAV. in Ps. 61. (al. 62.) § 2. col. 146, 7.

¹ Prius exercendum est in mandatis Dei, tum deinde viæ ejus considerandæ ; quia nisi fidelium operum usus præcesserit, doctrinæ cognitio non apprehendetur ; et agendum a nobis antea fideliter est, ut scientiam consequamur. Vias ergo, secundum superiore expositionem, Legem, Prophetas, omnia Evangelia et Apostolos esse existimamus. Id. in Ps. 118. (al. 119.) Litt. 2. § 10. col. 255.

² Ob id longe a peccatoribus salus est, quia non exquisierunt justificationes Dei, cum non utique ob aliud consignatæ litteris maneat, quam ut ad universorum scientiam notionemque defluerent. Id. In Ps. 118. (al. 119.) Litt. 20. § 5. col. 359.

³ Universis qui in vitam venirent Dei sermo consuluit, universæ ætati ipse aptissimus ad profectum. Id. Prolog. in Cant. quind. grad. § 4. col. 368.

⁴ Unigenitus igitur Deus naturæ in se suæ conscius, nativitatis propriæ in-

“For the discourses of man concerning the things of God, there are left to us no other words than those of God; *all other are both narrow and confined, and embarrassed and obscure.* If any one desires to describe this matter *in any other words than those in which it is declared by God, either he does not himself understand it, or he leaves it unintelligible to the reader.*”¹

“It ought first to be known, that God has not spoken to himself but to us, and has so *adapted his words to our intelligence as to enable the infirmity of our nature to receive and understand them.*”²

“Therefore God providing for the infirmity of man has not taught the faith by bald words of *doubtful meaning* I ask what other *fitter words he could have used* to make us understand his meaning, that he and the Father should be understood to be one, than, &c. [quoting John x. 30].”³

“The Lord has declared the faith of the gospel with the greatest possible simplicity of words; and has *adapted his language to our intelligence* as far as the infirmity of our nature could bear.”⁴

“The Apostolical words have not a meaning incautiously

enarrabile sacramentum, ad fidei tamen nostræ confessionem, quanta potest verborum absolutione significat, ut et natus intelligatur et in Dei natura esse credatur, etc. Id. ib. lib. vii. § 22. col. 930.

¹ Non relictus est hominum eloquiis de Dei rebus alius præter quam Dei sermo: omnia reliqua et arta et conclusa et impedita sunt et obscura. Si quis aliis verbis demonstrare hoc quam quibus a Deo dictum est, volet, aut ipse non intelligit, aut legentibus non intelligendum relinquit. Id. ib. lib. vii. § 38. col. 942.

² Primum cognosci oportet, Deum non sibi sed nobis locutum et in tantum ad intelligentiam nostram eloquii sui temperasse sermonem, quantum comprehendere ad sentiendum naturæ nostræ possit infirmitas. Id. ib. lib. viii. § 43. col. 973.

³ Consulens itaque humanæ infirmitati Deus non incerta verborum nuditate fidem docuit quæro quo alio ad intelligentiæ nostræ sensum expositionis suæ uti potuerit aptiore sermone, ut unum esse intelligerentur, quam, etc. Id. ib. § 52. col. 978.

⁴ Quanta potuit Dominus verborum simplicitate evangelicam fidem locutus est; et in tantum ad intelligentiam nostram sermones aptavit, in quantum naturæ nostræ ferret infirmitas. Id. ib. lib. ix. § 40. col. 1010.

expressed, or one that is doubtful so as to give room for impiety.”¹

Hence so far from thinking it necessary to appeal to “tradition,” because the heretics quoted Scripture, he says, “The meaning of those very declarations must be produced from the declarations themselves, that the truth may there be found where it is denied. For the things that are spoken by divine inspiration simply and to teach us the faith, are necessarily so spoken, that for that for which they are spoken they cannot be confirmed by the testimonies of declarations foreign to them.”²

He makes Scripture the judge for *the very reason* that heretics quoted it as in their favour.

And the reason he gives for heretical misinterpretations of Scripture is, not its obscurity, but that *what is read is adapted to a meaning, rather than a meaning adapted to what is read.*³

Many other passages of a like nature might easily be added.⁴

Moreover, on the means of attaining a knowledge of the true sense of Scripture, he speaks thus,—

After speaking of the Law being understood by Christians, he adds—“This perhaps may be thought bold. It is indeed bold if we take this glory to ourselves, if we think so much to be within the power of our infirmity, that with respect to things hidden for so long a time,

¹ Non incautis neque ad occasionem impietatis incertis significationibus sermo apostolicus loquitur. Id. lib. xi. § 17. col. 1092.

² Eorum ipsorum dictorum ratio ex his ipsis dictis afferatur; ut illic veritas reperiatur, ubi negatur. Quæ enim simpliciter et ad eruditionem fidei divinitus dicta sunt, necesse est ita dicta sint, ut ad id [ad] quod dicta sunt non alienorum atque extrinsecus dictorum confirmentur exemplis. Id. ib. § 7. col. 1086.

³ Nec negari possit, ex vitio malæ intelligentiæ, fidei exstistisse dissidium, dum quod legitur sensui potius coaptatur quam lectioni sensus obtemperat. Id. ib. lib. vii. § 4. col. 917.

⁴ See in Psalm 118. Litt. 1. § 7. col. 246. Ib. Litt. 14. § 2. col. 321, 2. In Psalm 135. § 2. col. 482. De Trin. lib. iv. § 17. col. 838. Ib. lib. vi. § 19. col. 890, 1.

obscure to so many ages of the human race, in seeking to attain the sense of which kings have laboured in vain, doctors and teachers of the law have themselves erred, we that are fools in the eyes of the world, the offscouring of the earth and madmen to the wise, should boast of understanding them. But yet we do understand them; because he is faithful who said, 'Ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you' It is not therefore of ourselves that we understand, but of him who hath given us to understand those things which were beyond our knowledge. *Therefore understanding is to be looked for from him, who will both open to those who knock, and will show to those who inquire, and will not refuse those that ask.*"¹

"It is a matter requiring great diligence to consider the force of the words used, and to know what belongs to each thing in the meaning of what is said. . . . In the divine Scriptures . . . if an impious ear and a rustic mind should hear them, it may neglect them as useless and unnecessary, but if a hearer or reader, *earnestly desirous of the knowledge of God*, shall have approached them, whose *frequent reading and gift of spiritual grace* shall have given him knowledge to discern and understand the several matters contained therein, he will admire every thing, and will use them according to their proper powers and qualities."²

¹ Hoc forte insolens existimetur. Plane insolens est si nobis hanc gloriam præsumimus, si tantum infirmitati nostræ licere volumus, ut tantis temporibus abstrusa, tantis humani generis obscura ætatibus, in quibus intelligendis frustra reges laboraverint, ipsi doctores et magistri legis erraverint, nos stulti sæculo et purgamenta mundi et deliramenta sapientibus eorum intelligentiam gloriamur. Sed tamen intelligimus; quia non mendax est qui dixit, Petite et dabitur vobis; quærite et invenietis, pulsate et aperietur vobis. . . . Non ergo ex nobis est quod intelligimus, sed ex eo qui quæ ignorabilia erant fecit intelligi. Itaque ab eo speranda intelligentia est, qui et pulsantibus aperiet et quærentibus demonstrabit et petentibus non negabit. *Id.* In Ps. 125. § 2. col. 407.

² Magnæ diligentiae res est, virtutem verborum collocatorum expendere, et scire quid cuique rei sub eorum quæ dicta sunt significatione sit proprium . . . In divinis Scripturis . . . si eas impia auris et mens rustica audiat, tamquam otiosas et non necessarias negligat, at vero si calens ad cognitionem Dei auditor

“He is the best reader [of the Scriptures] who looks for the meaning of the words from the words rather than imposes a meaning upon them, and *takes away a sense rather than brings it*; nor forces upon the words the appearance of that sense which before reading he presumed to be the meaning.”¹

“We trust, therefore, that thou, O God, wilt give an impulse to the commencement of this fearful undertaking, and strengthen us in its progress, and call us to communion with the prophetic or apostolic spirit, that we may understand their words in no other sense than that in which they uttered them, &c. . . Grant us, therefore, the knowledge of the meaning of the words, the light of intelligence, the force of the statements, the true faith, &c.”²

“Let us from the words look for the sense, from the sense let us gather the purport, and from the purport let us apprehend the truth.”³

“Let us seek the meaning in the following context. For the faith is to be derived not from our will, but *from the force of the words*.”⁴

“The meaning of the words must be sought, either from what goes before, or from what follows.”⁵

aut lector adstiterit, et cui frequens lectio et spiritalis gratiæ donum scientiam dijudicandi singula intelligendique præstiterit, mirabitur omnia, atque his secundum naturales eorum virtutes et efficientias utetur . . . collatis et virtutibus et temporibus et rebus non imperite his quæ sibi comperta fuerint utatur. *Id.* In Ps. 134. § 1. col. 468.

¹ Optimus lector est, qui dictorum intelligentiam exspectet ex dictis potius quam imponat, et retulerit magis quam attulerit; neque cogat id videri dictis contineri quod ante lectionem præsumserit intelligendum. *Id.* De Trin. lib. i. § 18. col. 776, 7.

² Exspectamus ergo ut trepidi hujus cæpti exordia incites, et profectu accrescente confirmes et ad consortium vel prophetalis vel apostolici spiritus voces: ut dicta eorum non alio quam ipsi locuti sunt sensu apprehendamus, etc. . . . Tribue ergo nobis verborum significationem, intelligentiæ lumen, dictorum honorem, veritatis fidem, &c. *Id.* ib. § 38. col. 786.

³ Ex verbis sensum sequamur, ex sensu rationem intelligamus, et ex ratione veritatem apprehendamus. *Id.* ib. lib. v. § 7. col. 858.

⁴ Intelligentiæ igitur sensum in consequentibus requiramus. Non enim fides ex arbitrio nostro, sed ex dictorum est ineunda virtutibus. *Id.* ib. lib. vii. § 33. col. 939.

⁵ Dictorum intelligentia aut ex præpositis aut ex consequentibus expetatur. *Id.* ib. lib. ix. § 2. col. 985.

“The man of the world does not comprehend the faith of the Apostle; and no other words than his own explain the declarations in which he has expressed his views.”¹

“Nor, in truth, would human infirmity carry itself forward to the knowledge of heavenly things, if it were not taught to understand the divine and inscrutable nature, by God bestowing upon it the gift of knowledge, through the teaching of the Spirit.”²

Such are the statements of Hilary on the means by which the sense of Scripture is to be ascertained.

EPIPHANIUS (A. D. 368.)

The testimony of Epiphanius is worthy of especial notice, as peculiarly clear and strong in favour of the views for which we contend.

“The Scripture,” he says, “always guarding against men falling into extremes, leads the mind from every quarter, into the middle path of truth . . . the whole Scripture sets before us *with clearness* the right path with respect to truth.”³

“You see *how clear* all things are relating to the truth, and no contradiction in the Scripture.”⁴

Again; having pointed out various texts of Scripture in refutation of the Arian heresy, he says, “You see that *all things relating to Christ* are *easy*, and nothing in them perplexed.”⁵ “The divine Scripture is *lifegiving*, and has nothing to offend the faithful, or *that can palliate blas-*

¹ Apostolicam fidem sæculi homo non capit, et sensus sui dicta alius præter quam ipsius sermo non explicat. Id. ib. § 10. col. 990.

² Nec sane humana infirmitas in cœlestem scientiam se ipsa proveheret, nisi Deo donum scientiæ per doctrinam Spiritus largiente ad cognitionem divini et imperspicibilis naturæ erudiretur. Id. In Ps. 118. [119.] Litt. 12. § 1. col. 309.

³ Αει γαρ ἡ γραφή ασφαλιζομένη τας κατὰ τὸ ἀκρον πτωσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐκ πανταχοθεν τὸν νοῦν συναγει ἐπὶ τὴν μέσσην τῆς ἀληθείας ὁδόν. . . . Τῆς πάσης γραφῆς σαφὺς περὶ ἀληθείας ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν ὑποτιθεμένης. EPIPHAN. De Hæres. hæc. 57. Noet. § 10. vol. i. p. 488.

⁴ Ὅρας ὡς πάντα τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας σαφὴ ὑπάρχει, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐναντίον ἐν τῇ γραφῇ. Id. Ib. hæc. 66. Manich. § 41. i. 654.

⁵ Ὅρας ὅτι πάντα τοῦ Χριστοῦ λεία, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτοῖς στραγγαλιώδες. Id. ib. hæc. 69. Arian. § 38. i. 760.

phemy against the Word."¹ Epiphanius, then, knew nothing of the doctrine that Scripture is so ambiguous, that an Arian may, without any offence against sound reason, find his errors there.

Again; in reply to the same heretics, he says,—“ And thus all things are *clear and perspicuous*, and no contradiction, nor anything at all tending to involve us in fatal error, as these men, in their wicked imaginations, pretend.”²

And a little further on he tells us how their errors arose, namely, from their “ not taking what is said as it was spoken, but putting an erroneous meaning upon it from their own fancies, and, from what is said, giving to that which is correctly spoken a false interpretation, in accordance with their own erroneous conceits.”³ Their fault was, not in their supposing that Scripture was expressed in sufficiently plain terms for them to understand what it meant, but that they were not contented to take Scripture as they found it, and interpret it in its obvious sense, but strained it to their own conceits.

Again; still more clearly, while replying to the same heretics,—“ Observe, O ye servants of Christ, and sons of the holy Church of God, and the orthodox faith, that there is *nothing difficult in the divine Scripture, nothing obscure, but all things are marvellously written, and rendered perfect, to forward our salvation.*”⁴

Again;—“ *All things are clear in the divine Scripture to those who are willing to come to the divine word with a pious mind; and not having cherished within themselves*

¹ Της θείας γραφης, ζωτικης ουσης, και μηδεν εχουσης εις προσκομμα πιστοις, η εις ελιτωμα βλασφημιας προς τον Λογον. ID. ib. hæc. 69. Arian. § 39, i. 762.

² Και ούτω παντα εστι σαφη και διανγη, και ουδεν εναντιον, ουδε θανατου παραπλοκης εχον ειδος εν τη θεια γραφη, ως ουτοι προφασιζονται, πονηρα έαντοις επινοουντες. ID. ib. p. 778.

³ Ου καθως ειρηται το ρητον εχοντες, αλλα κακως υπονοουντες, και απο ρητου το καλως ειρημενον κατα την κακην αυτων υπονοιαν παρερμηνευοντες. ID. ib.

⁴ ‘Ορατε Χριστου θεραπευοντες, και υιοι της αγιας του Θεου Εκκλησιας, και ορθοδοξου πιστεως, οτι ουδεν εν τη θεια γραφη σκολιον, ουδε στραγγαλιωδες, αλλα τα παντα θαυμασιως εις την ημετεραν σωτηριαν γεγραπται και τετελειωται. ID. ib. § 60, i. 787.

a diabolical spirit to hurl themselves headlong into the depths of death.”¹

“Everything that is in the divine Scripture, and everything that concerns the holy faith, is *lucid* to us, and *nothing difficult*, or contradictory, or *obscure*.”²

“For God is come, and the divine Scriptures *explain all things to us clearly*; for there is *nothing* in them *difficult* or *obscure*.”³

And from these Scriptures Epiphanius learnt the true faith, for he says, “The true faith, as preached everywhere, is declared to be this, *as I at least conceive, having been taught it from the Scriptures*, that there are three holy ones,” &c.⁴

And the requisites, the only requisites to which he adverts, for the right understanding of these Scriptures, are the careful study of them, and the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit.

Thus he speaks on these points.

Respecting the former, thus;—“All the divine words,” he says, “are not to be understood allegorically, but to be taken in their proper sense; but they need to be considered and apprehended, that we may know the force of each argument.”⁵

Respecting the latter, he speaks constantly; not as our opponents do, as if the teaching of the Holy Spirit was only to be expected through the teaching of the Church,

¹ Παντα γαρ σαφη εν τη θεια γραφη τοις βουλομενοις ευσεβει λογισμω προσερχεσθαι τω θειω λογω, και μη διαβολην [διαβολικην, *Pelav.*] ενεργειαν εν εαυτοις εγκλισησαντας εαυτους καταστρεφειν εις τα βαραθρα του θανατου. *Id. ib. hæc. 76. Anom. § 7. i. 920.*

² Παντα ημιν φωτεινα τα της θειας γραφης, και τα της αγιου πιστεως, και ουδεν σκολιον, η εναντιον, η στραγγαλιωδες. *Id. ib. p. 975.*

³ ‘Ο Θεος γαρ ηλθε, και εις [? *dele eis*] παντα ημιν σαφηνιζουσιν αι θειαι γραφαι. ουδεν γαρ εν αυταις εστι σκολιον, η στραγγαλιωδες. *Id. ib. § 41. ii. 46.*

⁴ Πιστη δε η καθολου κηρυκων φωνη, αυτη σημαινεται, ως εγω γε οιμαι, κατηχουμενος εκ γραφων, τρια αγαια, κ. τ. λ. *Id. ib. § 67. ii. 71.*

⁵ Παντα τα θεια ρηματα ουκ αλληγοριας δειται, αλλα ως εχει θεωριας δε δειται, και αισθησεως, εις το ειδεναι εκαστης υποθεσεως την δυναμιν. *Id. Adv. Hæres. hæc. 61. Apostol. § 6. i. 510, 11.*

but as an operation upon the heart of the individual, leading him into the knowledge of the truth.

This Spirit, he tells us, will enlighten the diligent reader of the Scriptures. "Search," he says, "the divine Scriptures, and learn the meaning of the Holy Spirit; and the Spirit itself that knows the Father and the Son, will reveal to thee the knowledge of the Word, the Son of God, that you may not wander from the truth, and lose your own soul."¹

But by those who have not received the enlightening influence of the Spirit, the Scriptures are not understood. "The divine words being spoken by the Holy Spirit, are not understood by those who have not received the gift and grace of the Holy Spirit."²

For he is the only effectual teacher; "The Holy Spirit . . . that teaches all things, that witnesses concerning the Son, that proceeds from the Father and from the Son, is *the only guide to truth, the interpreter of the holy laws, the teacher of the spiritual law,*" &c.³

Hence he gives us the exhortation,—“Let us understand the meaning of the Scripture, that the letter may not become death to us. For, saith he, [i. e. the Apostle] the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life. *Let us receive the Spirit*, that we may be profited by the letter. The letter doth not kill; in the letter is life. But it will kill him who comes without understanding to the letter, and that has not the revealing Spirit opening the letter, and unfolding that which is contained in it.”⁴ From

¹ Ερευνήσον τας θείας γραφάς, και μαθε του ἁγίου Πνευματος την δυναμιν, και λυτο το Πνευμα το γινωσκον τον Πατερα και τον Υιον αποκαλυπτει [² αποκαλυψει] σοι την του Λογου του Υιου του Θεου γνωσιν· ἵνα μη πλανηθης της αληθείας, και απολεσης την σεαυτου ψυχην. ID. Ancorat. § 19. tom. ii. p. 25.

² Εστι θεια τα ῥήματα Πνευματι ἁγίῳ λεγομενα, αγνωστα δε τοις μη ειληφοσι Πνευματος ἁγίου δωρεαν και χαριν. ID. ib. hæc. 69. Arian. § 43. i. 766.

³ Το Πνευμα το ἁγιον . . . το διδασκον τα παντα, το μαρτυρουν περι του Υιου, ο παρα του Πατρος και εκ του Υιου, μονος οδηγος αληθείας, νομων εξηγητης ἁγιων, πνευματικου νομου ὑφηγητης, κ. τ. λ. ID. Ancorat. § 73. ii. 78.

⁴ Νοησωμεν την δυναμιν της γραφης, ἵνα μη γενηται ἡμιν το γραμμα θανατος. Το γραμμα γαρ, φησι, αποκτεινει το δε Πνευμα ζωοποιει. Λαβωμεν το Πνευμα

which we may observe that this spiritual influence is not something, of which all baptized persons are possessed, but a peculiar influence vouchsafed for a particular purpose, of which they may be destitute.

Hence, lastly, he speaks thus of the dispositions and qualifications necessary for a right understanding of the Scriptures.

Writing against the Noetians, he says, “ But altogether to one who possesses *a mind inclined towards God*, and is enlightened by *the divine Scripture and the Holy Spirit*, their doctrine is easy of refutation, and appears full of all folly.”¹

Again ; writing against the Arian errors, he says,—“ As to all things in the divine Scripture, to one who possesses *the Holy Spirit*, and has received of the Lord *an attentive mind*, there is *nothing of which it is difficult to see the meaning* ; either as to the nature of our feelings towards the Father, or towards the Son, or towards the Holy Ghost. But all things are spoken in truth in the divine Scriptures most perfectly by our Lord himself and his Apostles, and the holy Prophets sent by him, but, nevertheless, prudently with a regard to each point handled, and in each place, according to the subject treated of.”²

BASIL OF CÆSAREA (fl. a. 370.)

“ All Scripture,” says Basil, “ is given by inspiration, and profitable, composed by the Spirit for this purpose ; that, as in a common repository for medicines for the

ἵνα ωφεληθῶμεν ἐκ τοῦ γραμματός. Οὐ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, ἐν τῷ γραμματι ἡ ζῶη. Ἀποκτείνει δὲ τὸν ἀσυνετὸς τῷ γραμματι προσερχομένον, καὶ μὴ ἐχόντα τὸ φράζον πνεῦμα, τὸ ἀνοίγον τὸ γράμμα, καὶ ἀποκαλύπτον τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ. *Id. ib. § 22. ii. 27.*

¹ Πάντῃ δὲ τῷ τὸν νοῦν εἰς Θεὸν κεκτημένῳ, καὶ ἐν θείᾳ γραφῇ, καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ κατηνύχασμένῳ εὐθυελεγκτός ὁ αὐτῶν λόγος, καὶ πάσης ἀνοίας ἐμπλὴς φαίνεται. *Id. ib. hæc. Noet. 57. § 3. i. 482.*

² Πάντα ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ τῷ κεκτημένῳ Πνεύμα ἁγίῳ καὶ νοῦν ἐγρηγορον παρὰ Κυρίου εἰληφότει, οὐδὲν ἐστὶ σκολιὸν ὑπονοῆσαι, ἡ παθούς εἶδος εἰς τὸν Πατέρα, ἡ εἰς τὸν Υἱόν, οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ; ἀλλὰ πάντα τελειοτάτα, οἰκονομικῶς δὲ εἰς ἑκάστην χρείαν, καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ τόπῳ πρὸς τὸ ὑποκειμένον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς εἰρηται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ Ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων Προφητῶν τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀπεσταλμένων. *Id. ib. § 66. i. 792.*

soul, we all may each of us choose out hence the cure of our own malady.”¹

Replying to the question, Whether he who should not do the Lord’s will, but should also neglect to inform himself what it was, had any ground of hope, he says, “Such a one evidently pretends ignorance, and cannot avoid the punishment of his sin. For, saith our Lord, if I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin, *the holy Scripture everywhere announcing the will of God to all.*”²

“*The things that appear of doubtful meaning, and obscurely delivered in some places of holy Scripture, are clearly explained by what is openly expressed in other places.*”³

“The best way to discover our duty, is the study of the inspired Scriptures Whatever any one may see that he is deficient in, by frequent use of them he will find, as from some public repository of medicines, the suitable remedy for his infirmity.”⁴

“Having the comfort that flows from the divine Scriptures, thou wilt need neither me nor any one else to enable thee to see what it behoves thee to do; having

¹ Πασα γραφή θεοπνευστος και ωφελιμος, δια τουτο συγγραφεισα παρα του Πνευματος, ἵν’ ὥσπερ εν κοινω των ψυχων ιατρειω, παντες ανθρωποι το ιαμα του οικειου παθους ἑκαστος εκλεγωμεθα. BASIL. CÆSAR. In Psalm. l. § 1. tom. i. p. 90. ed. Ben.

² Δηλος εστιν ὁ τοιουτος σχηματιζομενος την αγνοιαν, και αφευκτον εχει της ἁμαρτιας την κρισιν’ ει μη ηλθον γαρ, φησιν ὁ Kyrios, και ελαλησα αυτοις, αμαρτιαν ουκ ειχον’ νυν δε προφασιν ουκ εχουσι περι ἁμαρτιας αυτων, της ἁγιας γραφης πανταχου πασι το θελημα του Θεου διαγγελλουσης. ID. Reg. brev. xlv. ii. 429.

³ Τα αμφιβολα και επικεκαλυμμενως ειρησθαι δοκουντα εν τισι τοποις της θεοπνευστου γραφης, ὑπο των εν αλλοις τοποις ὁμολογουμενων σαφηνιζεται. ID. Ib. cclxvii. ii. 506. Quoted by Photius in art. Eulogius, 225. p. 761. ed. 1653.

⁴ Μεγιστη δε ὁδος προς την του καθηκοντος εὔρεσιν και ἡ μελετη των θεοπνευστων γραφων . . . περι ὅπερ αν ἑκαστος ενδεως εχοντος ἑαυτου αισθανηται, ἐκεινω [ἐκειναις] προσδιατριβων, οἶον απο τινος κοινου ιατρειου, το προσφορον εὔρισκει τω αρρωστηματι φαρμακον. ID. Epist. ad Gregor. ep. 2. (al. 1.) § 3. iii. 72, 3.

from the Holy Spirit advice which is *all-sufficient*, and guidance to that which will conduce to thy welfare.”¹

“I entreat her to spend her life in the study of the oracles of the Lord, that her soul may be nourished with sound doctrine, and her mind may grow and increase more than her body by nature.”²

He tells us, also, that the heretics always “take care not to teach simple souls from the divine Scriptures, but to circumvent the truth by human philosophy.”³

And in a work that has been by almost universal consent attributed to him, he thus accounts for the occasional obscurities of Scripture, and shows how he considered they were to be met. “As therefore,” he says, “our Creator, without grudging us the enjoyment of those things, has not permitted that all the necessities of life should be born with us, as in the case of the brutes, but has arranged that the want of necessary things should be an exercise of our understanding; so, also, he has contrived the obscurity that is in the Scriptures for the benefit of our mind, in order to rouse its energies; first, in order that being occupied with these, it may be withdrawn from lower pursuits; then that what is *acquired by labour*, may be the better loved, and that which has taken a long time to acquire, may remain the longer. But those things which are easily obtained, are but little valued in the enjoyment. . . . Moreover, there is need of purity of life, that that which is obscure in the Scriptures may be discerned, for the promotion of moral virtue.

¹ Ἐχουσα δε την εκ των θειων γραφων παρικλησιν, ουτε ἡμων ουτε αλλου τινος δεσηση προς το τα θεοντα συνοραν, αυταρκη την εκ του ἁγίου Πνευματος εχουσα συμβουλιαν, και οδηγιαν προς το συμφερον. ID. Epist. ad viduam. ep. 283. (al. 284.) iii. 424.

² Παρακαλω εν τη μελετη των λογιων του Κυριου διαγειν αυτην, ινα εκτρεφηται υπο της αγαθης διδασκαλιας την ψυχην, και επιδιδω προς αυξησιν και μεγαθος ἡ διανοια αυτης, μαλλον η το σωμα υπο της φυσσεως. ID. Ep. ad vid. ep. 296. (al. 285.) iii. 434. So elsewhere he calls the Scripture τροφη ψυχων, hom. in. Ps. 59. § 2. i. 190.

³ Τουτο γαρ αυτοις αι εστιν επιμελες, μη εκ των θειων γραφων διδασκειν τας ακεραιωτερας ψυχας, αλλ’ εκ της εξωθεν σοφιας παρακρουεσθαι την αληθειαν. Epist. ad Caesar. ep. 8. (al. 141.) § 2. iii. 81.

And in addition to purity of life, there is need, also, of exercise in the Scriptures, that the excellent mysteries of the divine oracles may, by continual study, be impressed upon the soul.”¹

Thus are the obscurities that are in the Scriptures to be solved; not by “tradition” or “the Church,” but by study and meditation. And the aid of God’s Holy Spirit is to be sought by us as our helper therein. For saith Basil, “If we even fail of treating the matter as it deserves, yet if, *by the aid of the Spirit*, we do not depart from the mind of Scripture, we shall not be altogether condemned as reprobates; and *by the aid of [divine] grace* shall afford some edification to the Church of God.”²

“I see that, even in the oracles of the Spirit, it is not open to every one to undertake the investigation of the things spoken, but to him who has the spirit of discernment, as the Apostle hath taught us, saying, in the distribution of spiritual gifts, ‘For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, &c.’ [1 Cor. xii. 3.]”³

¹ Ὡςπερ οὖν ἐν τοῖτοις οὐχὶ βασκαίνων ἡμῖν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν ἀφορμῶν παραπλησίως τοῖς ἀλογοῖς συναπογενεθῆναι πάντα ὁ δημιουργὸς ἡμῶν οὐ συνεχώρησεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐνδεῖαν τῶν ἀναγκαιῶν γυμνασίον ἡμῖν τῆς διανοίας ἐμῆχανησάτο, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ἀσάφειαν ἐπ’ ὠφελείᾳ τοῦ νοῦ, διεγείρων αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργεῖαν ἐπετηδένευσέ· πρῶτον μὲν ἵνα τοῖτοις ἐνασχολούμενος τῶν χειρῶν ἀφελκῆται· ἐπειτα ὅτι τὰ πονῶν κτηθέντα μᾶλλον πῶς ἀγαπάται, καὶ τὰ διὰ μακροῦ χρόνου προσγενομένα μονιμώτερον παραμένει· ὧν δὲ βᾶδια ἢ κτήσεις οὐ περισπούδαστος ἡ ἀπολαυσις. . . . Πρὸς δὲ τοῦτο χρεια τῆς ἐν τῷ βίῳ καθαροτήτος, ὥστε καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἠθικῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιτηδένουσιν τὸ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς κεκαλυμμένον διαγνωσθῆναι. Χρεια δὲ πρὸς τὴν καθαροτήτι τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς διατριβῆς, ἵνα τὸ σεμνοπρεπὲς καὶ μυστικὸν τῶν θείων λογίων ἐκ τῆς συνεχούς μελέτης ἐντυπώθῃ τῇ ψυχῇ. Comment. in Is. Præf. § 6. i. 382. The Benedictines, though placing this among the works falsely ascribed to Basil, admit that this Commentary has been always by almost general consent attributed to Basil, and that the only learned critic who has opposed this view is Petavius, and that it is certainly a work of the fourth century or thereabouts. See “Monitum,” ed. Ben. i. 377.

² Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῆς ἀξίας ἀπολείπομεθα, ἀλλ’ ἐὰν τοῦ βουλευματος τῆς γραφῆς μὴ ἐκπεσῶμεν τῇ βοηθείᾳ τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἀποβλητοὶ παντέλως κριθῶμεθα, καὶ τῇ συνεργίᾳ τῆς χάριτος οἰκοδομὴν τινα τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παρεξομεθα. In Hexaem. hom. 2. § 1. i. 12.

³ Ἐγὼ δὲ ὁρῶ ὅτι καὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὐ παντὶ ἐξὴν ἐπιβάλλειν τὴν ἐξέτασιν τῶν ἐξηγημάτων, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐχόντι τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς διακρίσεως, καθὼς ἐδι-

GREGORY OF NYSSA (fl. a. 370.)

Of the opinion of Gregory of Nyssa on this subject, we may judge from the following passage in his observations on the Psalms.

“Let us observe,” he says, “the skill with which the subject is treated; by which, though the course of life that is agreeable to virtue is so difficult and arduous, and the doctrine of the divine mysteries obscure, and the theology mysterious, and having its perfection in propositions difficult of comprehension, he hath made it *so easy to be comprehended and sweet*, that this instruction is not only an object of regard to men of perfection, who are already purified in the senses of their soul, but has become a possession which even women may call their own; and brings pleasure to babes, as one of their toys; and serves to old persons for a staff and rest; and that he who is joyful, thinks the gift of this instruction belongs to him; and that he who is in sorrow from misfortune, thinks that such a great blessing, *namely, of the Scripture*, was given on his account. Moreover, those who are journeying by land or by sea, or those who are engaged in sedentary operations, and, in short, all in every occupation, both men and women, well and ill, reckon it a misfortune to lose any opportunity of discoursing on this sublime instruction.”¹

δαξεν ἡμᾶς ὁ ἀποστολος, ἐν ταῖς διαιρέσεσι τῶν χαρισμάτων εἰπων· ὁ μὲν γὰρ δια τοῦ πνεύματος διδόται λόγος σοφίας, κ. τ. λ. Epist. ad. Neocæsar. ep. 204. (al. 75.) § 5. iii. 305.

¹ Τῆς εξετασέως σκοπήσωμεν τὴν ἐπινοίαν, δι’ ἧς οὕτως σκληρὰν τε καὶ συντονὸν οὖσαν τὴν κατ’ ἀρετὴν πολιτείαν, τὴν τε τῶν μυστηρίων αἰνιγματώδη διδασκαλίαν, καὶ τὴν ἀπορρητὸν τε καὶ κεκρίμενὴν δυσεφικτοῖς θεωρημασὶν θεολογίαν, οὕτως εὐληττὸν [εὐληπτὸν] τε καὶ γλυκεῖαν ἐποίησεν, ὥς μὴ μόνον τελείοις ἀνδράσιν τοῖς ἤδη κεκαθαρμένοις τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰσθητήρια τὴν διδασκαλίαν ταυτὴν σπουδαῖζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς γυναικωνιτιδος ἰδίων γενεσθαι κτήμα· καὶ νηπίοις ὥς τι τῶν αἰθρημάτων ἥδονην φερεῖν· καὶ τοῖς παρηλικότεροις ἀντιβακτηρίας τε καὶ ἀναπαύσεως γινεσθαι, τὸν τε παιδρυνόμενον ἑαυτοῦ νομίζειν εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλίας ταυτῆς τὸ δῶρον· καὶ τὸν σκυθρωπὸς ἐκ περιστάσεως διακειμενός, δι’ αὐτὸν οἰεσθαι τὴν τοιαύτην τῆς γραφῆς χάριν δεδωσθαι· ὀδηγοῦντες τε πρὸς τοῦτοις καὶ θαλαττεύοντες ἀνθρώποις, ἡ τισὶν ἐπιδιφριοῖς ἐργασίαις προσασχολουμένοι, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀπαξάπλως ἐν πᾶσιν ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες, ἐν ὑγείᾳ τε καὶ ἀρρωστία, ζῆμιαν ποιοῦνται, τὸ μὴ διὰ στομάτος τὴν ὑψηλὴν ταυτὴν διδασκαλίαν φερεῖν. GREG. NYSS. Tract. 1. in Psalm. Inscript. c. 3. tom. i. pp. 261, 2.

Such is his language, not with respect to the clear and plain statements of the New Testament, but with respect to the Book of Psalms. And I think that from it we may form a tolerably well-founded conclusion as to what would have been his sentiments on the general question of the aptness of Scripture, as a whole, to teach the faith.

EPHRÆM SYRUS (fl. a. 370.)

“We,” says Ephræm Syrus, “will apply our own mind to the truth, under the guidance of the inspired Scripture. For they, whose minds are not enlightened by the divine teaching, are far from the truth.”¹

“Wherefore, my brother, watch diligently, and be always earnest in attending to reading, that it may teach thee how to avoid the snares of the enemy, and obtain eternal life. For the reading of the divine Scriptures restrains the mind wandering into error, and gives knowledge towards God. For it is written, Be still, and know that I am God. Thou hearest, my brother, that he who rests from other pursuits to study the divine Scriptures with a true heart, receives the knowledge of God. Wherefore, my brother, neglect not thy soul, but give thyself to reading and to *prayer, that thy mind may be enlightened*, and that thou mayest become perfect and entire, wanting in nothing. Let others boast of their converse with great men, and rulers, and kings. Boast thou before the angels of God at conversing with the Holy Spirit, through the holy Scriptures. For it is the Holy Spirit that speaks through them. Therefore, be earnest in reading the holy Scriptures, and persevering in prayer. For, as often as thou dost meet God through them, so often thy body and soul is sanctified. Therefore, my brother, knowing this, be more frequent and earnest in reading them.”²

¹ Ἡμεῖς δε τη αληθεια επιστησομεν την εαυτων νουν, οδηγουμενοι υπο της θεο-πνευστου γραφης. Οἱ γαρ μη περιλαμβομενοι τον νουν υπο της θειας διδασκαλιας πορω εχουσι τον εαυτων νουν απο της αληθειας. EPHRÆM SYR. Adv. Gentil. error. Op. tom. iii. p. 49.

² Διο, αδελφε μου, νηψον ασφαλως και σπουδασον αι τη αναγνωσει προσκολ-

And for the interpretation of the word he thus directs us to the teaching of the Holy Spirit. "When thou art about to sit down and read, or to hear any one reading, pray to God first, saying, O Lord Jesus Christ, open my ears and the eyes of my heart, that I may hear thy words and understand and do thy will Always thus pray to God, that he may enlighten thy mind, and manifest to thee the meaning of his words. For many have erred through confidence in their understanding, and professing themselves to be wise have become fools, not understanding what was written, and have fallen into blasphemies and perished." ¹

Here we see what Ephræm considered to be the way to avoid error and heresy, not the taking our faith from any body of men, but from the Holy Scriptures, with earnest prayer to God to enable us rightly to understand them.

MACARIUS OF EGYPT (fl. a. 373.)

Our next testimony is from Macarius. Let the reader consider how far the following testimony is reconcileable

λασθαι, ἵνα σε διδάξῃ πως δεῖ ἐκφυγεῖν τὰς παγίδας τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ καταλαβεῖν τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν. Συστελλεῖ γὰρ ἀναγνώσις τῶν θείων γραφῶν τὸν νοῦν πλανώμενον, καὶ δαρεῖται γινῶσιν εἰς Θεόν. Γεγραπται γὰρ, Σχολασατε, καὶ γινῶτε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεός. Ἀκουεῖς, ἀδελφε μου, ὅτι γινῶσιν Θεοῦ λαμβάνει ὁ σχολαζὼν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἐν ἀληθινῇ καρδίᾳ. Διο, ἀδελφε, μὴ ἀμελήσῃς τῆς ψυχῆς σου, ἀλλὰ σχολάζε τῇ ἀναγνώσει, καὶ ταῖς εὐχαῖς ὅπως φωτισθῇ σου ἡ διάνοια, καὶ ὅπως γένη τέλειος, καὶ ὁλοκληρὸς, ἐν μηδενὶ λειπομένος. Ἄλλοι καυχῶνται ἐπὶ συνομελία μεγιστάνων, ἀρχόντων τε καὶ βασιλέων. Σὺ δὲ καυχᾶσαι ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ συνομελῶν τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι διὰ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν. Τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐστὶ τὸ λαλοῦν δι' αὐτῶν. Σπουδάζε οὖν ἐντυγχάνειν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς καὶ προσκαρτερεῖν ταῖς εὐχαῖς. Ὅσακις γὰρ ἐντυγχάνεις τῷ Θεῷ δι' αὐτῶν, τὸσαυτακὶς ἁγιαζέται σου τὸ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴ. Τοῦτο οὖν γινώσκων, ἀδελφε μου, σπουδάζε πυκνότερως ἐντυγχάνειν αὐταῖς. IDEM. De Sec. Adv. Op. tom. iii. p. 99, repeated in his Treatise, De Panoplia, tom. iii. pp. 230, 31.

¹ Ὅταν δὲ μελλῇς καθεστῆναι καὶ ἀναγνῶναι, ἡ ἀναγινώσκοντος ἀκουσαί, δεηθῇ πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, λέγων, Κυριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστε ἀνοῖξον τὰ ὦτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας μου, τοῦ ἀκουσαί με τῶν λόγων σου, καὶ συνιέναι, καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ θελημα σου Οὕτω πάντοτε εὐχῶ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅπως φωτισθῇ σου τὸν νοῦν, καὶ δηλώσῃ σοὶ τὴν δυνάμιν τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐπλανήθησαν θάρρησαντες τῇ συνέσει αὐτῶν, καὶ φισκόντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν, μὴ νοῦντες τὰ γεγραμμένα, καὶ περιεπέσον εἰς βλασφημίας καὶ ἀπώλοντο. ID. Ib. p. 101. Repeated in his Treatise De Panoplia, p. 233.

with the notion that Scripture is insufficient to teach the faith. "God, the supreme king," says Macarius, "has sent the divine Scriptures as his *Letters to mankind*, having clearly declared by them that those who have called upon God, and believed in him, may claim and receive the heavenly gift."¹ Are they written, then, so as to be insufficient to deliver his message?

AMBROSE (fl. a. 374.)

"He," saith Ambrose, "that is versed in the words of the Apostles, is acquainted with the commands of Jesus our Lord."²

"The books of the heavenly Scriptures are good pastures, by which we are fed by daily reading, by which we are renewed and refreshed, when we taste the things that are written, or ruminate frequently upon that which has been but tasted. *Upon these pastures the flock of the Lord is fattened.*" And a little further on, on the words, "thy word is a light unto my feet," he says, "The eye of our mind is fed with the light of this spiritual lamp, which shines before us in this night of the world, lest like those who walk in darkness we should stagger with uncertain footsteps, and be unable to find the right path."³

"*That no one may err, let him follow those things by which the Holy Scripture, that we may be able to understand the Son, hath pointed him out.* He is called the Word, he is called the Son, he is called the Power of God, &c."⁴

¹ Τας θείας γραφάς ὡς περ ἐπιστολάς ἀπεστείλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Θεὸς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, δηλώσας δι' αὐτῶν, ἵνα παρακαλεσάντες τὸν Θεόν, καὶ πιστευσάντες αἰτησώσι καὶ λαβώσι δῶρεαν οὐρανίον. MACAR. ÆGYPT. hom. 39. (Par. 1622. p. 203.)

² Qui exercetur in verbis Apostolorum Jesu Domini mandata cognoscit. AMBROS. In Ps. 118. Sermon. 2. § 35. tom. i. col. 993. ed. Ben.

³ Bona pascua libri sunt Scripturarum cœlestium, in quibus quotidiana lectione pascimur, in quibus recreamur ac reficimur, cum ea quæ scripta sunt degustamus, vel summo ore libata frequentius ruminamus. His pascuis grex Domini saginatur. . . . Pascitur oculus noster interior lucernæ spiritualis lumine, quæ nobis in hac mundi nocte præluet, ne sicut in tenebris ambulantes incertis titubemus vestigiis et viam veram invenire nequeamus. ID. In Ps. 118. Sermon. 14. §§ 2, 5. i. col. 1140, 1141.

⁴ Certe, ne quis possit errare, sequatur ea quibus Scriptura Sancta, ut in-

“When I consider, O august Emperor, how it is that the human race has so erred as that most, alas! follow different views respecting the Son of God, it appears by no means wonderful that human knowledge hath erred respecting heavenly things, but that it hath not *rendered obedience to the Scriptures.*”¹

It required only “obedience to the Scriptures” to follow the true faith.

“In most places Paul so explains his meaning by his own words, that he who discourses on them *can find nothing to add of his own*; and if he wishes to say anything must rather perform the office of a grammarian than a discourseser.”²

Other passages, confirmative of the same view, might easily be added.³

And of that spiritual teaching by which the meaning of the word is made known to the hearts of *individuals*, he speaks thus,—

“Does it not sometimes happen, that when we think of anything out of the Scriptures, and cannot find its interpretation, while we doubt and seek, suddenly he [i. e. God the Word] appears to come to us over the mountains, that is, the highest doctrines, and then appearing to us as it were above the hills, illuminates our mind, that he may infuse into our understandings that which seemed difficult to us to find out? Therefore the Word, from being as it were absent, becomes present in our hearts. And, again,

telligere possimus Filium, significavit. Verbum dicitur, Filius dicitur, Dei Virtus dicitur, etc. *Id. De fide, lib. i. c. 2. ii. 447.*

¹ Consideranti mihi, Imperator Auguste, qua ratione sic erraverit genus hominum, ut de Dei Filio plerique, vae mihi, diversa sequerentur, nequaquam satis mirum videtur quia erravit humana scientia de supernis, sed quod Scripturis non detulit obedientiam. *Id. De fide, lib. iv. c. 1. ii. 521.*

² In plerisque ita se ipse suis exponat [i. e. Paulus] sermonibus, ut is qui tractat, nihil inveniat quod adjiciat suum; ac si velit aliquid dicere, grammatici magis quam disputatoris fungatur munere. *Id. Epist. Class. 1. ep. 37. § 1. ii. 930.*

³ See De Cain et Abel, lib. ii. c. 6. § 22. i. 216. In Psalm. 37. Præf. § 7. i. 818. In Psalm. 118. Sermon. 12. § 28. i. 1123. *Ib.* Sermon. 22. § 19. i. 1251. Exhort. virg. c. 9. ii. 292. *Epist. Class. 1. ep. 18. § 7. ii. 835.*

when anything is rather obscure to us, the Word is as it were withdrawn, and we desire his presence as that of one who is absent; and, again appearing, he shows himself to us, and is as it were present to us in the knowledge of those things we are inquiring into.”¹

“God teaches and illuminates the minds of each, and pours into them the light of knowledge, if thou dost open the doors of thy heart, and dost give entertainment to the light of heavenly grace. When thou art in doubt, inquire diligently; for he that seeks finds, and to him that knocks it is opened. There is much obscurity in the prophetic Scriptures; but if with the hand of thy mind thou dost knock at the gate of the Scriptures, and diligently examine those things that are hidden, thou wilt begin by degrees to collect the meaning of the words; and it shall be opened to thee by no other than the Word of God, of whom thou hast read in the Apocalypse, that the Lamb opened the sealed book, &c.”²

“To enable him to interpret the word, let him seek the assistance of God.”³

JEROME (fl. a. 378.)

We proceed to Jerome.

“What other life can there be without the knowledge of

¹ Nonne cum aliquid de Scripturis cogitamus, et explanationem ejus invenire non possumus, dum dubitamus, dum quærimus, subito nobis quasi super montes altissima dogmata videtur adscendere; deinde quasi super colles apparens nobis illuminat mentem; ut infundat sensibus quod invenire posse difficile videbatur? Ergo quasi ex absente fit præsens Verbum in cordibus nostris. Et rursus cum aliquid nobis subobscurum est tamquam subducitur Verbum et tamquam absentis adventum desideramus; et iterum apparens ostendit se nobis, tamquam præsens sit nobis in iis quæ requirimus cognoscendis. In Psalm. 118. Serm. 6. § 9. i. 1035.

² Docet Deus et mentes illuminat singulorum et claritatem cognitionis infundit, si tu aperiās ostia cordis tui et cœlestis gratiæ recipias claritatem. Quando dubitas, diligenter inquiras; qui enim quærit, invenit, et ei qui pulsatur, aperitur. Multa obscuritas est in Scripturis propheticiis; sed si manu quadam mentis tuæ Scripturarum januam pulses, et ea quæ sunt occulta, diligenter examines, paulatim incipies rationem colligere dictorum; et aperietur tibi non ab alio sed a Dei Verbo, de quo legisti in Apocalypsi quod agnus librum signatum aperuit, &c. In Psalm. cxviii. Serm. 3. § 59. i. 1078.

³ Ut verbum emolat, Deum quærat. Expos. Luc. lib. viii. § 63. i. 1486.

the Scriptures, through which we become acquainted with Christ himself, who is the life of those who believe?"¹

"It is sufficient for me that I should speak *so as to be understood*, that disputing concerning the Scriptures, I should imitate *the plainness of the Scriptures*."²

"Love the Holy Scriptures, and wisdom will love thee; love her, and she will preserve thee; honour her, and she will embrace thee; let these be the ornaments on thy breast and in thy ears."³

Again, commenting on Is. c. viii. vv. 19, &c., he says, that the meaning of the prophet was, that if they wished to know doubtful matters they must apply themselves with greater diligence to the Law and the testimonies of the Scriptures, adding, "To us God hath to a greater extent given the Law and the testimonies of the Scriptures, which, if you are unwilling to follow, you will not have light, but darkness will always overwhelm you, which shall pervade your land and doctrine."⁴

"It is the custom of the Scriptures to subjoin what is manifest to what is obscure, and *openly and plainly to declare what they have before spoken enigmatically*."⁵

And as it respects the interpretation of the Scriptures, and the way in which men are led to embrace their true meaning, thus he speaks.

"Unless all things that are written are opened by him

¹ Quæ enim alia potest esse vita sine scientia Scripturarum, per quas etiam ipse Christus agnoscitur, qui est vita credentium. Hieron. Ep. ad Paulam, ep. 30. § 7. tom. i. col. 149.

² Mihi sufficit sic loqui ut intelligar, ut de Scripturis disputans Scripturarum imiter simplicitatem. Id. Ep. ad Damasum, ep. 36. § 14. i. 168.

³ Ama Scripturas sanctas, et amabit te sapientia; dilige eam, et servabit te; honora illam, et amplexabitur te. Hæc monilia in pectore et in auribus tuis hæreant. Id. Ep. ad Demetriad. ep. 130. § 20. i. 997.

⁴ Si vultis nosse quæ dubia sunt, magis vos Legi et testimoniis tradite Scripturarum Magis nobis Deus legem dedit et testimonia Scripturarum, quæ si sequi nolueritis non habebitis lucem; sed semper caligo vos opprimet, quæ transibit per terram vestram atque doctrinam. Id. In Is. c. 8. vv. 19, &c. iv. 126, 7, and 128.

⁵ Moris est Scripturarum, obscuris manifesta subnectere, et quod prius sub ænigmatibus dixerint, aperta voce proferre. Id. In Is. c. 19. v. 1. iv. 201.

who hath the key of David, who opens and no man shuts, and shuts and no man opens, they will be opened by *no other interpreter.*"¹

"In expounding the Holy Scriptures, we always need the presence of the Spirit of God."²

"Marcion and Basilides, and the other heretics, have not the gospel of God, because they have not the Holy Spirit, without which the gospel that is taught becomes human."³

And speaking of commentaries and commentators, he says,—“What place have commentaries? . . . They repeat the opinions of many persons, and say, Some interpret this place in such a way, and others in such another way.”⁴ But we find no notice of the principle of *traditive interpretation*, on which our opponents insist.

THEOPHILUS OF ALEXANDRIA (fl. a. 385.)

For the sentiments of Theophilus of Alexandria on this matter, let us observe the force and bearing of the following passages.

“By the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures, let each one pour oil into his faculties, and prepare the lamp of his mind, so that, according to the precept of the gospel, it ‘may give light to all that are in the house.’ (Matt. v. 15.) . . . Let us mingle with the heavenly choir, as if already in mind translated thither; and viewing the abodes of glory, let us be now what we are about

¹ Nisi aperta fuerint universa quæ scripta sunt ab eo qui habet clavem David, qui aperit et nemo claudit, claudit et nemo aperit, nullo alio reserante pandentur. Id. Ep. ad Paulin. ep. 58. § 9. i. 325, 6.

² Semper in exponendis Scripturis sanctis illius [i. e. Spiritus Dei] indigemus adventu. Id. In Mich. c. l. vv. 10, &c. vi. 441.

³ Marcion et Basilides et cæteræ hæreticorum pestes non habent Dei evangelium, quia non habent Spiritum sanctum, sine quo humanum fit evangelium quod docetur. Id. In Galat. c. l. vv. 11, 12. vii. 386.

⁴ Commentarii quid operis habent? Alterius dicta edisserunt; quæ obscure scripta sunt, plano sermone manifestant; multorum sententias replicant, et dicunt, Hunc locum quidam sic edisserunt, alii sic interpretantur, &c. Id. Contra Ruff. lib. i. § 16. ii. 471. See, also, ib. lib. iii. § 11. ii. 541.

to be. Of which blessedness the Jews have made themselves unworthy, who having left the riches of holy Scripture, and given themselves up to the teaching of their rabbies, to this day it is said of them, ‘They do always err in their heart.’ [Ps. xciv. 10.]”¹

Again; “Whence, if we wish to be partakers of salvation, and cleaving to the pursuit of virtue to purge our souls of their evil propensities, and to wash away whatever impurity there is in us, by the continual meditation of the Scriptures, contemplating as it were under a clear sky *the openly revealed doctrines of the Christian faith*, let us hasten to celebrate the feast of heavenly joy.”²

Again;—“Leaving the shades of error and the cold of ignorance, let them, like the Magi, turn themselves to the rise of the Sun of righteousness, and inhabiting the warmest region under heaven, which is experienced in the heat emanating from the Scriptures, let them, despising the madness of Origen, ask their ecclesiastical pastors, and say, ‘Where is he who is born King of the Jews?’ And when they shall have found him lying in the manger, *that is, in the plain unadorned discourse of the Scriptures*, let them offer to him gold and frankincense and myrrh, that is, an approved faith shining with all the splendour of truth, the fragrant of a sweet smelling conversation and continence.”³

¹ Quotidiana lectione sanctorum Scripturarum quisque infundat oleum sensu suo, et paret mentis lucernam, quæ juxta præceptum Evangelii ‘luceat omnibus qui in domo sunt’ [Matth. v. 15.] cœlestibus misceamur choris, ut jam nunc illuc mente translati, et augustiora videntes loca simus quod futuri sumus. Qua beatitudine indignos se fecere Judæi, qui Scripturæ sanctæ opibus derelictis, et ad pauperis intelligentiæ adquiescentes magistros, hodie audiunt; ‘semper errant corde.’ [Ps. xciv. 10.]. THEOPHIL. ALEX. in Epist. Paschal. 1a. §§ 1, 2. in Bibl. Vet. Patr. ed. Galland. tom vii. p. 616.

² Unde si volumus salutis esse participes, et adhærentes studio virtutum animarum vitia purgare, et quidquid in nobis sordium est, jugi Scripturarum meditatione diluere; quasi sub sudo apertam doctrinarum scientiam contemplant, festinemus supernæ lætitiæ festa celebrare. Id. in Ep. Pasch. 2a. § 1. p. 623.

³ Erroris tenebras frigusque ignorantie relinquentes, ad ortum solis justitiæ,

Again;—"Sailing in the same vessel with the Saviour our Lord, like his disciples, we have passed over the sea, and entering the haven of rest, we arrive at *the lovely shore of the divine volumes, and pluck the various flowers of knowledge, and kissing the snowy limbs of wisdom, we remain fixed in her embraces For as many as read the Holy Scriptures with diligence, and wander through the variegated meadows of the heavenly discourses, enjoy this blessedness.*"¹ In these passages, then, Holy Scripture is clearly set forth as the great teacher on all points connected both with faith and practice.

AUGUSTINE (fl. a. 396.)

We proceed to Augustine, who, in a passage already quoted, has thus borne his clear and decided testimony to the plainness of Scripture in all the important points of faith and practice;—

"In those things," he says, *"which are plainly delivered in the Scriptures, are found all those things which contain faith and practice, hope, that is, and charity."*²

And in the context of this passage he observes,—*"The Holy Spirit hath most wisely and profitably so fashioned the Holy Scriptures, as by the plainer places to meet the*

juncti magorum studiis convertantur, et inhabitantes calidissimam plagam cœli, quæ in Scripturarum fervore sentitur, pastores ecclesiasticos, spreta Origenis amentia, sciscitentur, et dicant; 'ubi est qui natus est rex Judæorum?' Cum illum invenerint jacentem in præsepi, humili videlicet eloquio Scripturarum, offerant ei aurum et tus et myrrham, id est, fidem probatam et omni veritatis splendore fulgentem, conversationisque bene olentis fragrantiam et continentiam. Id. in Ep. Pasch. 2a. § 19. p. 630.

¹ Cum Salvatore Domino, instar discipulorum illius, navigantes transfretavimus, et portum quietis intrantes, pulcherrimum divinorum voluminum litus amplectimur; varios carpentes flores scientiæ, et nivea membra sapientiæ pressis figentes osculis, in ejus hæremus amplexibus Quotquot enim diligentius Scripturas Sanctas legunt, et per picta sermonum cœlestium prata discurrunt, hac beatitudine perfruuntur. Id. in Ep. Pasch. 2a. § 20. p. 630.

² In iis quæ aperte in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi, spem scilicet atque caritatem. AUGUSTINI De doctr. Christ. lib. ii. c. 9. Tom. iii. Part. 1. col. 24. ed. Ben.

wants of mankind, and by the more obscure to remove their pride. For hardly anything is extracted from those obscurities which is not elsewhere found *most plainly* delivered.”¹

And to the same effect he says elsewhere,—“ The phraseology of Scripture, how accessible is it to all, although seen through by very few! The things which it contains plainly expressed, like a familiar friend, it speaks without obscurity to the heart both of unlearned and learned. But in those things which it speaks mysteriously, it does not exalt itself by a lofty phraseology, so that the slow and unlearned mind dare not approach it, like a pauper with a rich man; but it *allures all by a simple phraseology*, whom it not only feeds with the truth that is plainly expressed in it, but also exercises with that which is hidden, *having the same thing in the parts that are easy as in those that are difficult of comprehension*. But lest the things plainly expressed should be disdained, the same things again mysteriously expressed are sought after, the things sought after are again in a certain way brought back to the mind, and the things thus brought back to the mind are pleasantly signified to it. By these things thus advantageously ordered, both perverse minds are corrected, and weak minds nourished, and great minds delighted.”²

¹ Magnifice igitur et salubriter Spiritus Sanctus ita Scripturas sanctas modificavit, ut locis apertioribus fami occurreret, obscurioribus autem fastidia detergeret. Nihil enim fere de illis obscuritatibus eruitur, quod non planissime dictum alibi reperitur. Id. De doctr. Christ. lib. ii. c. 6. iii. P. 1. col. 22.

² Modus ipse dicendi quo sancta Scriptura contextitur, quam omnibus accessibilis, quamvis paucissimis penetrabilis. Ea quæ aperta continet, quasi amicus familiaris, sine fuco ad cor loquitur indoctorum atque doctorum. Ea vero quæ in mysteriis occultat, nec ipsa eloquio superbo erigit, quo non audeat accedere mens tardiuscula et inerudita, quasi pauper ad divitem; sed invitat omnes humili sermone, quos non solum manifesta pascit, sed etiam secreta exerceat veritate, hoc in promptis quod in reconditis habens. Sed ne aperta fastidirentur, eadem rursus operta desiderantur, desiderata quodam modo renovantur, renovata suaviter intimentur. His salubriter et prava corriguntur, et parva nutriuntur, et magna oblectantur ingenia. Id. Ep. ad Volus. ep. 137. (al. 3.) c. 5. ii. 409.

“ In the whole extent of the Holy Scriptures we are fed by the parts that are plain, our faculties are exercised by those that are obscure; by the former our hunger is driven away, by the latter our pride.”¹

“ God hath brought the Scriptures down to the capacity of infants and babes.”²

Again, speaking on one particular passage, he says,—
 “ What can be plainer than this? What clearer? I fear lest perhaps when I treat of it desirous to explain it, that which by itself is perspicuous and clear, may become obscure. For they who do not understand these words, or pretend that they do not understand them, much less understand mine, or admit that they understand them; unless, perhaps, they may for this reason quickly understand ours, that it is allowable for them to laugh at them when understood, but with the words of the Apostle the same is not allowable. Moreover, where they cannot interpret the words otherwise, in accordance with their own views, they reply *even with respect to those that are clear and plain, that they are obscure and of doubtful meaning*, because they dare not call them wicked and perverse.”³ This, it is true, is spoken more especially of a particular passage, not of the Scripture generally; but nevertheless the passage appears to me to contain some useful and pertinent remarks, in connexion with the point now in question.

Again; “ If Scripture should not use such words, it

¹ In omni copia Scripturarum sanctarum pascimur apertis, exercemur obscuris: illic fames pellitur, hic fastidium. *Id.* Sermon. de verb. Dom. 71. (al. 11.) c. 7. v. 389.

² Inclinauit Scripturas Deus usque ad infantium et lactentium capacitatem. *Id.* In Psalm. viii. § 8, iv. 42.

³ Quid hoc apertius? quid clarius? Vereor ne forte cum dissero volens id exponere, obscurum fiat quod per se lucet et claret. Qui enim hæc verba non intelligunt, aut se non intelligere fingunt, mea multo minus intelligunt vel se intelligere profitentur: nisi forte propterea cito intelligant nostra, quia conceditur eis intellecta deridere, de Apostoli autem verbis non idem conceditur. Propterea ubi aliter ea secundum suam sententiam interpretari non possunt, etiam clara et manifesta obscura et incerta esse respondent, quia prava et perversa non audent. *Id.* De op. Monach. c. 9. vi. 482.

would not find its way in a familiar manner to *all kinds of men, whose benefit it wishes to provide for*, that it may both alarm the proud, and rouse the negligent, and exercise the inquiring, and provide food for the intelligent; which it would not do if it did not first *lower itself*, and in some degree *stoop to those that are fallen*.”¹

“Believe me, whatever is in the Scriptures is sublime and divine; truth is altogether in them, and a system of discipline most suited to restore and renew the soul; and *evidently so fashioned, that there is no one who cannot draw from thence what is sufficient for him, if only he comes to draw, as true religion requires, with an earnest and pious mind*.”²

Once more; “If,” he says, “I should be ignorant as to any of those things, how it may be demonstrated and explained, yet, nevertheless, this I am convinced of, that even here THE TESTIMONY OF THE DIVINE ORACLES WOULD HAVE BEEN MOST CLEAR, IF A MAN COULD NOT BE IGNORANT OF IT, WITHOUT LOSING THE PROMISED SALVATION.”³

If such testimonies as these are not sufficient, I know not what words could be used to express the view for which we contend.

Moreover, the directions he gives for the interpretation of Scripture, are the same as those we have quoted from the preceding Fathers.

In his Treatise “De doctrina Christiana,” he discourses at large on this subject, and his directions are such as

¹ Si non utatur Scriptura talibus verbis, non se quodam modo familiaris insinuabit omni generi hominum, quibus vult esse consultum, ut et perterreat superbientes, et excitet negligentes, et exerceat quærentes. et alat intelligentes: quod non faceret, si non se prius inclinaret, et quodam modo descenderet ad jacentes. Id. De Civ. Dei, lib. xv. c. 25. vii. 410.

² Quidquid est, mihi crede, in Scripturis illis, altum et divinum est: inest omnino veritas, et reficiendis instaurandisque animis accommodatissima disciplina; et plane ita modificata, ut nemo inde haurire non possit quod sibi satis est, si modo ad hauriendum devote ac pie, ut vera religio poscit, accedat. Id. De util. cred. c. 6. viii. 54.

³ Et si enim quodlibet horum, quemadmodum demonstrari et explicari possit, ignorem: illud tamen credo, quod etiam hinc divinorum eloquiorum clarissima auctoritas esset, si homo id sine dispendio promissæ salutis ignorare non posset. Id. De pecc. mer. et remiss. lib. ii. c. ult. x. 71.

these;—after saying that “in those things that are delivered *plainly* in the Scriptures, are found all those things that contain faith and practice,” he adds,—“an acquaintance being made with the language of the divine Scriptures, we must proceed to the discussion and resolution of those things that are obscure, that instances from the plainer places may be taken for the illustration of the obscurer passages, and some testimonies of passages that are clear, may remove doubt from those that are obscure.”¹ Again; “Where things are clearly stated, there we must learn how they are to be understood in obscure passages.”² And he exhorts us to consult the Hebrew and Greek originals,³ the context, the circumstances, the persons, the times, &c. of what is said;⁴ and, in a case of doubt, the inquirer must “consult the rule of faith which he has received *from the plainer places of Scripture*, and the testimony (auctoritate) of the Church;”⁵ of which “rule of faith,” he says elsewhere, that “*it is sufficiently known to the faithful, through the Scriptures.*”⁶ He is, no doubt, alluding to the creed; but this, be it recollected, he held to be not (like the Tractators) something derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles, and fuller or plainer than Scripture; but as a formula, derived *immediately from the Scriptures*, its words being scattered through the divine Scriptures, and *collected thence*, and put together, as a help

¹ Facta quadam familiaritate cum ipsa lingua divinarum Scripturarum, in ea quæ obscura sunt aperienda et discutienda pergendum est, ut ad obscuriores locutiones illustrandas de manifestioribus sumantur exempla et quædam certarum sententiarum testimonia dubitationem incertis auferant. *Id. De doctr. Christ. lib. ii. c. 9. iii. P. 1. col. 24.*

² Ubi apertius ponuntur, ibi discendum est quomodo in locis intelligantur obscuris. *Id. Ib. lib. iii. c. 26. iii. P. 1. col. 56.* For similar remarks, see *Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 68. vi. 221, 2. De Civ. Dei, lib. xi. c. 33. vii. 298. Retract. lib. ii. c. 54. i. 59.*

³ *Id. Ib. lib. ii. c. 11. col. 25.*

⁴ See *Ib. lib. iii. cc. 3, 5, 10, 17, 18, 27, 28.*

⁵ Consulat regulam fidei quam de Scripturarum planioribus locis et Ecclesiae auctoritate percepit. *Id. Ib. lib. ii. c. 2. iii. P. 1. col. 45.*

⁶ Etsi voluntatem auctoris libri hujus indagare nequivimus, a regula tamen fidei, quæ per alias ejusdem auctoritatis sacras litteras satis fidelibus nota est, non aberravimus. *Id. De Civ. Dei, lib. xi. c. 33. vii. 298.*

to the memory.¹ The reference, therefore, is altogether agreeable to the view we are here supposing Augustine to take, the creed being merely, in his opinion, a compendium of the plain passages of Scripture, which it was in the power of every one to draw for himself from Scripture; and by these plain places, as he constantly tells us, the obscure are to be interpreted.

Thus, also, in his controversy with the Donatists, he says, "Let us choose the passages that are plain and clear. And if passages of this kind were not found in the Holy Scriptures, there would be no means by which the dark passages might be opened, and the obscure explained."² "Let the Donatists point out their Church . . . in all the canonical testimonies of the sacred books. Nor let them do this so as to collect and relate those that are couched in obscure, or doubtful, or figurative language, which every one can interpret as he likes, according to his own view. For such passages cannot be rightly understood and explained, unless, first, those things that are most plainly delivered, are held by a firm faith."³

The Christian's faith, then, rests upon, and is directed by, *first*, those plain passages of Scripture that are level with the capacity of all, and in which the rule of faith is contained, and from which every serious and devoted mind may draw what is *sufficient* for his salvation; and *then* upon what the more obscure passages, when illustrated by the plain, appear to deliver.

And in judging of the meaning of those more obscure passages, we must take care not to depart from the truth as delivered in the plain; as Augustine elsewhere exhorts.

¹ See vol. 1. p. 145.

² Quæque aperta et manifesta deligamus. Quæ si in sanctis Scripturis non inveniuntur, nullo modo esset unde aperirentur clausa et illustrarentur obscura. *Id. Ep. ad Cath. contra Donat. vulg. De unit. Eccles. c. 5. ix. 342.*

³ Ecclesiam suam demonstrent . . . in omnibus canonicis sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus. Nec ita, ut ea colligant et commemorent, quæ obscure vel ambigue vel figurate dicta sunt, quæ quisque sicut voluerit interpretetur secundum sensum suum. Talia enim recte intelligi exponique non possunt, nisi prius ea, quæ apertissime dicta sunt, firma fide teneantur. *Id. ib. c. 18. (al. 16.) ix. 371.*

“When,” he says, “we read the divine books, in so great a number of orthodox senses that are extracted from a few words, and fortified by the sound Catholic faith, let us prefer that which it may appear certain was the meaning of him whom we are reading: but if this is not evident, then certainly that which the circumstances of the text do not oppose, and which agrees with the sound faith; but if the circumstances of the text, also, cannot be fully investigated and discovered, at least that only which the orthodox faith prescribes.”¹

To such passages as these, the Romanists are accustomed to reply that such directions for the interpretation of Scripture are all very good in their way, but insufficient and uncertain; and that the traditive interpretation of the Church is alone certain and authoritative. To which I answer, that if there is any certain and authoritative interpretation, so far as it exists, these modes of endeavouring to obtain the sense of Scripture are *not* good, nor to be resorted to, because the former demands our assent; and by resorting to the latter, we neglect a privilege given to us, and expose ourselves unnecessarily to a liability to error. They are good only on the supposition that we are bound, as individuals, to endeavour to ascertain the meaning of God’s Word, and have no certain and authoritative interpretation to guide us. And therefore it cannot be supposed that Augustine, when giving these directions, held all the while that there was another, and an infallible, method of knowing what the meaning of Scripture is. And secondly, those who contend that he did, are bound to show from his writings that such was the case.

I will only add that Augustine, like the Fathers in ge-

¹ Cum divinos libros legimus in tanta multitudine verorum intellectuum, qui de paucis verbis eruuntur, et sanitate Catholicæ fidei muniuntur, id potissimum deligamus, quod certum apparuerit eum sensisse, quem legimus: si autem hoc latet, id certe quod circumstantia Scripturæ non impedit, et cum sana fide concordat: si autem et Scripturæ circumstantia pertractari ac discuti non potest, saltem id solum quod fides sana præscribit. *Id. De Genes. ad lit. lib. i. c. 21. iii. P. l. 131, 2.*

neral, looked through the means to a Divine Teacher to make them effectual. "Perhaps," he says, "we act rashly, in that we wish to discuss and investigate the words of God. But why were they uttered, except that they may be known? Why were they published abroad, but that they may be heard? Why were they heard, but that they may be understood? Therefore may God assist us, and grant us as much as he thinks fit to vouchsafe."¹

CHRYSOSTOM (fl. a. 398.)

Our next witness is Chrysostom; to whose testimony we would more particularly call the attention of the reader, as supporting, in the most express and unequivocal way, the view for which we contend.

I refer the reader, first, to his third sermon on Lazarus, the whole of which bears strongly upon our present subject; and where, among other remarks of the same tendency, he speaks thus;—"As to smiths, the instruments of their art are the hammer, the anvil, and the tongs; so *the instruments of our art* are the apostolical and prophetic books, and all Scripture divinely-inspired and profitable. And as they make by their instruments all the vessels they take in hand, so we also, through these, *form our souls*; correcting them when depraved, and renewing them when grown old."² And having earnestly exhorted his hearers to the study of the Scriptures, anticipating the objection that they could not understand them, he tells them that where they did not fully understand, the very

¹ Temere fortasse facimus, quia discutere et scrutari volumus verba Dei. Et quare dicta sunt, nisi ut sciantur? Quare sonuerunt, nisi ut audiantur? Quare audita sunt, nisi ut intelligantur? Confortet ergo nos, et donet nobis aliquid quantum ipse [i. e. Deus] dignatur. Id. In Johann. tract. 21. § 12. iii. P. 2. 462.

² Καθαπερ γάρ ἐκείοις ἐργαλεῖα τῆς τέχνης ἐστὶ σφυρὰ καὶ ἀκμῶν καὶ πυραγρὰ οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν ἐργαλεῖα τῆς τέχνης ἐστὶν, ἀποστολικά καὶ προφητικά βιβλία, καὶ πᾶσα γραφὴ θεοπνευστος καὶ ὠφελίμος. Καὶ καθαπερ ἐκεῖνοι δι' ἐκείνων τὰ σκευὴ πάντα, ἅπερ ἀν λαβῶσι, διαπλαττοῦσιν οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τούτων τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν χαλκεύομεν, καὶ διεστραμμένην διορθοῦμεν, καὶ παλαιωθεῖσαν ἀνακαινίζομεν. CHRYSOSTOMI De Lazaro concio iii. § 2. tom. i. p. 738. ed. Ben.

reading would do them good ; adding this expressive testimony on the point now in question,—“ But, on the contrary, it is impossible that you can remain ignorant of all things in it alike. For, on this account, the grace of the Spirit ordered that publicans, and fishermen, and tent makers, and shepherds, and goatherds, and ignorant and illiterate men, should compose these books ; that *no one of those who are ignorant, should have it in his power to resort to this excuse ;* to the intent that the things spoken might be *easily understood by all ;* that both the handicraftsman, and the servant, and the poor old woman, and the most unlearned of all men, might gain and be profited by the hearing. For it was not for vain glory, as the heathen, but *for the salvation of the hearers,* that they who, from the beginning, were honoured with the grace of the Spirit, composed all these writings.” The heathen philosophers, he adds, sought their own glory, and therefore spoke *obscurely*, “ *but the Apostles and the Prophets did everything the very reverse of this ; for they set before all the things that they delivered in clear and plain terms, as the common teachers of the whole earth, to the intent that every one might be able, EVEN BY HIMSELF, to learn what was said* FROM THE READING ONLY. . . . *For to whom are not all things in the Gospels plain ?*”¹ And then proceeding to reason further with the objector on the folly of his allegation of obscurity against the Scriptures, he says,—“ This is an excuse, a pretext, a veil for sloth. Under-

¹ Ἄλλως δὲ, ἀδύνατον πάντα ἐπιστῆς ἀγνοεῖν· δια γὰρ τοῦτο ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος οἰκονομήσῃ χάρις τελώνας καὶ ἁλίας καὶ σκηνοποιοὺς καὶ ποιμένας καὶ αἰπολοὺς καὶ ἰδιώτας καὶ ἀγρομάτους ταῦτα συνθεῖναι τὰ βιβλία, ἵνα μηδεὶς τῶν ἰδιωτῶν εἰς ταύτην ἐχῇ καταφευγεῖν τὴν προφασιν, ἵνα πᾶσιν εὐσυννοητὰ ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα ἵνα καὶ ὁ χειροτέχνης, καὶ οἰκετῆς, καὶ ἡ χηρὰ γυνή, καὶ ὁ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτωστός, κερδαῖν τε καὶ ὠφεληθῇ παρὰ τῆς ἀκροάσεως. Οὐ γὰρ πρὸς κενοδοξίαν, καθαπερ οἱ ἐξώθεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀκουόντων ταῦτα πάντα συνεβήκαν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν καταξιώθεντες τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος . . . Οἱ δὲ ἀποστολοὶ καὶ οἱ προφῆται τουναντίον ἅπαν ἐποίησαν. Σαφὴ γὰρ καὶ δηλὰ τὰ παρ’ ἐαυτῶν κατεστήσαν ἅπασιν, ἅτε κοῖνοι τῆς οἰκουμένης ὄντες διδασκαλοὶ, ἵνα ἕκαστος καὶ δι’ ἐαυτοῦ μάθῃται δύνηται ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως μόνῃς τὰ λεγόμενα.

. . . Τινι γὰρ οὐκ ἐστὶ δηλὰ τὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἅπαντα ; ID. Ib. §§ 2, 3. i. 739, 740.

stand you not what is in the Scriptures? How, indeed, should you be able ever to understand, when you do not even desire to glance at them? Take the book into your hands; read all the historical parts; and retaining in your memory the parts easy of comprehension, go over frequently the parts that are difficult and obscure. And should you not be able, by assiduous reading, to find out the meaning of what is said, go to one that is wiser, go to a teacher, communicate with him respecting what is written, show much earnestness; and, if God should see you exercising so much readiness of mind, he will not despise your diligence and solicitude; but if man should not teach you what you seek, he himself will certainly reveal it. Remember the Eunuch of the Queen of Ethiopia . . . ‘But there is no Philip present now.’ No, but *the Spirit that moved Philip is present*. My beloved, *let us not trifle with our salvation*. All these things were written for us, for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.”¹

It would be difficult to find words more expressive of the view for which we contend. And yet, perhaps, in the following passage that view is carried out so as to be still more strongly enforced. It is a favourite reply of the Romanists and Tractators upon this subject, to say, (like drowning men catching at a straw,) Yes, the Scriptures are clear when the meaning has been pointed out, but not before. What sort of an answer this is, I leave the reader to determine, for it is almost impossible to deal

¹ Σκηψίς ταῦτα καὶ προφασίς καὶ νωθείας παρακαλύμματα. Οὐ νοεῖς τὰ ἐγκείμενα; Πῶς γὰρ δύνηση νοησαὶ ποτε, μὴδε ἅπλως ἐγκύβει βουλομένος; Λαβε μετὰ χεῖρας τὸ βιβλίον· ἀναγνώθι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἅπασαν· καὶ τὰ γινώριμα κατασχών, τὰ ἀδηλά καὶ τὰ ἀσαφὴ πολλακίς ἐπέλθε. Καν μὴ δύνηθης τῇ συνέχειᾳ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως εὗρειν τὸ λεγόμενον, βαδίσον πρὸς τὸν σοφώτερον, ἔλθε πρὸς τὸν διδασκαλόν, ἀνακοινώσαι περὶ τῶν εἰρημένων, πολλὴν ἐπιδείξει τὴν σπουδὴν· καν ἰδῇ σε ὁ Θεὸς τοσαύτη κεχρημένον τῇ προθυμίᾳ, οὐ περιοφεται σοῦ τὴν ἀγρπνίαν καὶ τὴν φροντίδα· ἀλλὰ καν ἀνθρώπος μὴ διδάξῃ τὸ ζήτουμενον, αὐτὸς ἀποκαλύψει πάντως. Ἀναμνησθητι τοῦ Εὐνουχοῦ τῆς βασιλίδος Αἰθιοπῶν. . . . ΑΛΛ’ οὐ παρῆστιν ὁ Φίλιππος νυν· ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ κινήσαν τὸν Φίλιππον παρῆστι. Μὴ καταφρονῶμεν τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν, ἀγαπητοί. Ταῦτα πάντα ἐγγραφὴ δι’ ἡμᾶς, πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰῶνων κατήντησε. ID. IB. § 3. i. 740.

seriously with it. But be its force what it may, it is at least demolished, as far as Chrysostom is concerned, by the following passage: "Why should I come to Church, saith one, if I do not hear some one preach? This is it that hath destroyed and marred everything. For what need is there of a preacher? The need arises from our own laziness. For *why is there any need of a sermon?* ALL THINGS IN THE DIVINE SCRIPTURES ARE CLEAR AND STRAIGHT; ALL THINGS THAT ARE NECESSARY ARE MANIFEST."¹ They are manifest, says Chrysostom, without any preacher to make them so. There needs nothing but the words themselves.

After these testimonies, it may seem almost superfluous to add any others. But it may be well to show that they stand not alone in his works, but are borne out by many others scattered throughout them.

Thus speaking of the misinterpretations of Scripture by heretics, he says,—“Tell me not that the Scripture is in fault; it is not the Scripture that is in fault, but their folly I say this in order that no one may accuse the Scriptures, but the folly of those who misinterpret what is well spoken. For even the devil disputed with Christ from the Scriptures; but the Scripture was not in fault, but the mind that misinterpreted what was well said.”²

“One thing only the Apostle aimed at, that the whole world might learn something of those things that would be of service to it, and that are able to transfer it from earth to heaven. *Therefore he did not conceal his instructions by any darkness and obscurity but his doctrines*

¹ Τι εισερχομαι, φησιν, ει ουκ ακουω τινος δμιλουτος; τουτο παντα απολωλε και διεφθειρε. Τι γαρ χρεια δμιλητου; Απο της ημετερας βαθυμιας αυτη η χρεια γεγονε. Δια τι γαρ δμιλις χρεια; παντα σαφη και ευθεα τα παρα ταις θειαις γραφαις· παντα τα αναγκαια δηλα. *Id.* In 2 Thess. hom. 4. § ult. xi. 528.

² Μη μοι λεγε οτι η γραφη αιτια· ουχι η γραφη αιτια, αλλ' η αγνωμοσυνη αυτων. . . . Ταυτα λεγω ινα μηδεις τας γραφας διαβαλλη, αλλα την αγνωμοσυνην των τα καλως ειρημενα κακως ερμηνευοντων. Και γαρ ο διαβολος υπο γραφων τω Χριστω διελεγετο· αλλ' ουχ η γραφη αιτια, αλλ' η διανοια η τα καλως ειρημενα κακως ερμηνευουσα. *Id.* Hom. De Sancto Phoca. § 3. ii. 708.

*are more manifest than the rays of the sun He has made his words so easy to be understood, that all he has said is clear, not only to men, and those that are intelligent, but even to women and youths."*¹

"If we would thus search the Scriptures with accuracy, and not superficially, we should be able to attain our salvation; *if we would constantly give our attention to them, we should attain the knowledge of the orthodox faith, and the principles of a perfect life."*²

"Wherever St. Paul says anything obscure, he elsewhere interprets himself."³

"LOOK FOR NO OTHER TEACHER; THOU HAST THE ORACLES OF GOD; NO ONE TEACHES THEE LIKE THEM. For man often hides many things through vain-glory and envy. Hear, I entreat you, all ye that have a care for your life, and get those books that are the medicines of the soul. . . . Want of acquaintance with the Scriptures is the cause of all evils."⁴

Many others might be added, to some of which I give a reference below.⁵

¹ Ἐν μόνον ἐσπουδασεν, ὅπως ἡ οἰκουμένη πᾶσα μαθοῖ τι τῶν χρησίων καὶ δυναμένων αὐτὴν ἀπο τῆς γῆς μεταστῆσαι πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν· διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ ζῶντι καὶ σκοτῶ ἐκρύψεν ἑαυτὸν τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀλλὰ τὰ τούτου δογματα τῶν ἡλιακῶν ἀκτίνων ἐστὶ φανερώτερα τοσαύτην τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐγκατεμίξεν ευκολίαν, ὥς μὴ μόνον ἀνδράσι καὶ συνετοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖξι καὶ νεοῖς ἅπαντα εἶναι τὰ λεγόμενα δηλὰ. *Id.* In Johann. hom. 2. (al. 1.) § 3. viii. 10.

² Ἀν οὕτω τοῖνον θελωμεν τὰς γραφὰς ἐρευνᾶν μετὰ ἀκριβείας καὶ μὴ ἁπλως, δυνήσομεθα τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐπιτυχεῖν· ἂν διὰ παντός αὐταῖς ἐνδιατρίβωμεν, καὶ δογμάτων ὀρθότητά καὶ βίον εἰσομεθα ἠκριβωμένον. *Id.* In Johann. hom. 53. (al. 52.) § 3. viii. 313.

³ Πανταχού γὰρ ὅταν τι ἀσαφές εἰποῖ, ἑαυτὸν ἐρμηνεύει παλιν. *Id.* In 2 Cor. hom.. 9. § 1. x. 499.

⁴ Μὴδε περιμεινῆς ἕτερον διδασκαλόν. ἐχεις τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οὐδεὶς σε διδάσκει ὡς ἐκεῖνα. Οὗτος μὲν γὰρ πολλὰ καὶ διὰ κενοδοξίαν καὶ διὰ βασκανίαν ἐπικρύπτει πολλάκις. Ἀκούσατε, παρακαλῶ, πάντες οἱ βιωτικοί, καὶ κτίσθε βιβλία φάρμακα τῆς ψυχῆς. . . . Τοῦτο πάντων αἰτίον τῶν κακῶν, τὸ μὴ εἶδεναι τὰς γραφὰς. *Id.* In Coloss. hom. 9. § 1. xi. 391.

⁵ See in Genes. hom. 9. § 1. iv. 65. E. *Ib.* hom. 10. § 7. iv. 79. D. In Genes. serm. 3. § 1. iv. 655. D, E. In Ps. 41. § 7. v. 141. E. 142. A. In Matt. Proem. seu hom. 1. § 5. vii. 11. C. In 2 Cor. hom. 7. §§ 2, 3. x. 482. E. and 484. D. In Heb. hom. 8. § 4. xii. 89. A, C, D. To which we may add the passage, In Act. hom. 33. § 4. ix. 258. E. already quoted, p. 436.

Hence we meet in Chrysostom with constant exhortations to the reading of Scripture, with statements of the great benefits that would be derived from its perusal, and the evils arising from a want of acquaintance with it.¹

And for the occasional obscurity of Scripture he gives this reason ;—"There is a great and unspeakable treasure, beloved, in the words just read, and there needs an attentive mind, and a sober and vigilant judgment, that nothing may escape us of what is hidden in these few words. For on this account the merciful God has not permitted *all* things that are found in the Scriptures to be easy of perception, and manifest to us of themselves, and from the bare reading, that he might rouse our sluggishness, and that we might have to exercise great vigilance to derive the full benefit from them. For those things that are found by labour and research, have usually a better hold upon our minds ; but the things that are easy usually escape quickly from our hearts."²

Again ; "Why do you say, I know not the meaning of these words? On this very account it behoved you to apply your mind to them. But if not even that which is obscure rouses your mind, much more would you have hastily run over them if they were clear. For neither is this nor are all things clear, that you may not be idle ;

above. Also Pseudo-Chrysostomi Hom. de cæco nato. § 1. *init.* viii. app. 61. A. which is considered by the Benedictines as written by an antient author, probably not much posterior to Chrysostom.

¹ See In Genes. hom. 29. § 2. iv. 281. A, B, C. In Coloss. hom. 9. § 1. xi. 390. D. In Genes. hom. 3. § 1. iv. 14. A, B. Ib. hom. 10. § 8. iv. 81. C. Ib. hom. 24. § 1. iv. 216. D, E. Ib. hom. 60. § 3. iv. 580. D, E. In Rom. Proæm. § 1. ix. 426. A, B.

² Πολυς ὁ θησαυρος και ἀφαιτος, ἀγαπητοι, ἐν τοῖς προσφατοῦ ἀναγνώσθῃσι, και δεῖ συντεταμένης διανοίας, και λογισμοῦ νηφοῦτος και διεγρηγμένου, ὥστε μηδὲν ἡμᾶς παραδραμεῖν τῶν ἐγκεκρυμμένων τοῖς βραχεσί τουτοῖς ῥημασί. Διὰ γὰρ τουτο και ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεος οὐκ αὐτοθεν, και ἐκ ψίλης ἀναγνώσεως πάντα τὰ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς κείμενα εὐσυνόπτα και δηλὰ ἡμῖν τυγχάνειν συνεχωρήσεν, ἵνα τὴν νωθεῖαν ἡμῶν διεγείρῃ, και πολλὴν τὴν ἀργυρνιακὴν ἐπιδειξάμενοι, οὕτω τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὠφελείαν καρπώσωμεθα. Εἰώθε γὰρ πῶς τὰ μὲν μετὰ πόνου και ζήτησεως εὐρίσκομενα μᾶλλον ἐμπηγνυσθαι ἡμῶν τῇ διανοίᾳ· τὰ δὲ μετ' εὐκολίας, θαπτον ἀφίπτασθαι τῆς καρδίας τῆς ἡμετέρας. In Gen. hom. 32. §. 1. iv. 316.

nor are all things obscure, that you may not despair . . . Know you not the meaning of what is said? Then *pray* that you may learn it. But it is impossible that you can be ignorant of all things, for many things are of themselves perfectly manifest and clear.”¹

Further; as it respects the interpretation of Scripture, and the way in which we must ascertain its true meaning, he speaks thus.

“The Holy Scripture,” he says, “when it would teach us anything of the kind, interprets itself, and does not suffer the hearer to err.”²

“You see how Scripture interprets itself.”³

And hence he exhorts us to observe the scope, the context, &c., of the passage whose meaning we seek.

“As a building is weak without a foundation, so the Scripture profits us not, unless we ascertain its scope.”⁴

“It is not sufficient to say, It is written in the Scripture, but it is necessary to read the whole of the context,” &c.⁵

Such are the directions he gives for ascertaining the sense of Scripture.

But more especially prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which he teaches us that every Christian is entitled from the promises of God to look for *individually*,

¹ Τι φης; ουκ οίδα τινα εστι τα λεγομενα. Δι’ αυτο μεν ουν τουτο προσεχειν εχρην. Ει δε ουδε το ασαφες διεγειρει σου την ψυχην, πολλω μαλλον, ει σαφη ην, παρεδραμες. Ουδε γαρ τουτο, ουτε σαφη παντα εστιν, ινα μη βαθυμησης· ουτε ασαφη, ινα μη απογνως . . . Ουκ οισθα τα λεγομενα; Ουκουν ευξαι ινα μαθης· μαλλον δε αμηχανον παντα αγνοειν· τα γαρ πολλα αυτοθεν εστι καταδηλα και σαφη. In 1 Cor. hom. 37. § ult. x. 342.

² Καιτοι γε της αγιας γραφης, επειδαν βουλεται τι τοιουτον ημας διδασκειν, εαυτην ερμηνευουσης, και ουκ αφιεισης πλανασθαι τον ακροατην. Id. In Genes. hom. 13. § 3. iv. 103.

³ ‘Ορας πως εαυτην ερμηνευει η γραφη. Id. In Ps. 44. § 6. v. 169.

⁴ ‘Ως γαρ ανευ θεμελιου σαθρα η οικοδομη· οτως ανευ της εδρεσεως του σκοπου ουκ ωφελει η γραφη. Id. In Ps. 3. § 1. v. 2.

⁵ Ου τοιουν αρκει το ειπειν, οτι εν τη γραφη γεγραπται, αλλα χρη και την ακολουθιαν αναγνωναι πασαν, κ. τ. λ. Id. Hom. in illud, Domine non est in homine, etc. § 2. vi. 160. A similar passage occurs in his In Johann. hom. 40. (al. 39.) § 1. viii. 236. And Pseudo-Chrys. hom. in dict. Apost. Non quod volo facio, etc. § 1. viii. 189. App.

to lead him into the knowledge of the meaning of Scripture.

"If," he says, *"thou wouldest accustom thyself to pray with earnestness, thou wouldest not want instruction from thy fellow-servants, God himself enlightening thy mind without the intervention of any one."*¹

"We have a merciful master, and when he sees us using diligence, and showing a great desire to understand the divine oracles, *he does not permit us to stand in need of anything else, but immediately enlightens our mind*, and bestows upon us the illumination that comes from him, and, according to his excellent wisdom, *implants in our soul the whole of the true doctrine* [of Christianity]."²

"If you will attend diligently to the reading of Scripture, you shall *need nothing else*. For the word of Christ is true, that says, Seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened to you."³

Many other passages of a similar nature might be added, to some of which I give a reference below.⁴

Such is the testimony of one of the most illustrious of those Fathers to whom our opponents are continually referring as the supporters of their views. It is needless to add one word to direct the judgment of any impartial reader. I say *impartial*, because of those who accuse Scripture of obscurity, even in the fundamental points, I

¹ Εαν εβισης σεαυτον ευχεσθαι μετ' ακριβειας, ου δεσηση της παρα των συνδουλων διδασκαλιας, αυτου σοι του Θεου χωρις μεσιτου τινος καταναγαζοντος την διανοιαν. ID. Contr. Anom. hom. 3. § 6. i. 469.

² Και γαρ φιλανθρωπων εχομεν δεσποτην, και επειδαν ιδη μεριμνωγτας ημιας, και ποθον πολυν επιδεικνυμενους προς την των θειων λογιων κατανοησιν, ουκ αφησιν ετερου τινος δεσθηναι, αλλ' ευθεως φωτιζει τον ημετερον λογισμον, και την παρ' αυτου ελλαμψιν χαριζεται, και κατα την ευμηχανον αυτου σοφιαν πασαν την αληθη διδασκαλιαν εντιθησι τη ημετερα ψυχη. ID. In Genes. hom. 24. § 1. iv. 216.

³ Ὑμεις ει θελετε μετα προθυμιας προσεχειν τη αναγνωσει, ουδενος ετερου δεσησεσθε. Αψευδης γαρ ο του Χριστου λογος, ειπων· ζητειτε και ευρησετε, κρουετε, και ανοιγησεται υμιν. ID. In Rom. Proœm. § 1. ix. 425.

⁴ In Genes. hom. 35. § 1. iv. 349. E. 350. C, D. Ib. § 2. iv. 352. B, C. In 1 Thess. hom. 7. § ult. xi. 477. B, C.

will not venture to say that they may not do the same by these testimonies of Chrysostom, or anything else that may be offered them.

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA (fl. a. 412.)

“The law given through the learned Moses,” says Cyril of Alexandria, “was involved as it were in darkness and shadows, such, I mean, as arose from the letter. But in the declarations of the gospel, the beauty of the truth shines forth unclouded and clear, and enlightens the mind, being poured like light into the understandings of the pious.”¹

“*Sufficient, sufficient for this* [i. e. for obtaining a knowledge of the faith] *are the Scriptures of the holy Fathers,* [i. e., as the words following show, *the inspired writers,*] *which if any one would diligently study and vigilantly attend to, he would immediately have his mind filled with divine light. For they did not speak of themselves, but ‘all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable.’”*²

¹ Ἀχλὺ μὲν γὰρ οἶονεὶ πῶς καὶ κατασκίασμασι, τοῖς ἀπο γέ φημι τοῦ γραμματος, ὃ διὰ τοῦ πανσόφου Μωσέως κατεπαχύνετο νόμος. Ἐν δὲ γέ τοις εὐαγγελικοῖς κηρυγμασι γυμνὸν καὶ διαφανές το τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκφαίνεται κάλλος, καὶ καταφαιδρύνει τὸν νοῦν ταῖς τῶν εὐσεβούντων διανοίαις φωτὸς δικήν εἰσχομένον. CYRILL. ALEX. Comm. in Is. lib. 3. tom. i. Op. tom. ii. p. 361. The phrase εὐαγγελικά κηρυγματα is used in other places for *Scripture*, thus,—παροισθεντῶν εἰς μέσον τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ ἀποστολικῶν κηρυγματῶν. Quod unus sit Christus. Dial. tom. v. P. 1. p. 758. See also De S. Trin. Dialog. 3. tom. v. P. 1. p. 476, and again p. 477. The context in all these passages clearly shows that *Scripture* only is intended. And so the phrase “*evangelica prædicatio*” is used by Cyprian;—“Scriptum est, nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest intrare in regnum Dei. Quo in loco quidam, quasi evacuare possint humana argumentatione *prædicationis Evangelicæ* veritatem, catechumenos nobis opponunt,” &c. Ep. ad Jubaian. Ep. 73.

² Ἄλις γὰρ ἄλις αἱ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων εἰς τοῦτο συγγραφαί, αἷς εἰπερ τίς ἔλοιτο νοῦνεως ὀμλεῖν καὶ ἐγρηγορῶς προσφερεσθαι, φωτὸς ἀν τοῦ θείου τοῦ οικείου εὐδὺς ἀναμειστώσει νοῦν. Ἦσαν γὰρ οὐκ αὐτοὶ λαλόντες ἐν αὐτοῖς, πᾶσα δὲ γραφή θεοπνεύστος καὶ ὠφελίμος. De S. Trin. Dial. 1. tom. v. P. 1. p. 388. The phrase τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, here used to denote the inspired writers, or probably more peculiarly the Apostles, is used also by Epiphanius for the Apostles; Παρελαβὼν γὰρ (says Epiphanius) οἱ ταύτης [i. e. Ἐκκλησίας] παῖδες

Again, on the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, he says, that the error may easily be avoided, "for it is open to those who desire it, easily to avoid the error, and to escape from the pernicious and destructive doctrine of those of the opposite party, by piously giving the due superiority to the declarations of the sacred writers." ¹

Again, opposing certain unorthodox views respecting the incarnation of our Lord, he says,—“What, therefore, supposing this to have been the case, would have been the use of his advent, or what the mode of his incarnation? But if any one perchanceshall ask on what account this was done, [namely, that he became incarnate,] *he shall receive from us the reply, the divine Scripture will teach you. Go, then, illustrious Sir, inquire of the sacred Scriptures, and having well applied the eye of your mind to the declarations of the holy Apostles, you shall then clearly see what you seek.*” ²

Again; “*Therefore the inspired Scripture is abundantly sufficient, even so that those who have been nourished by it ought to come forth wise and very prudent, and possessed of an understanding abundantly instructed in all things. . . . What that is profitable to us is not spoken of by it?* For, first, (what is also more excellent than all other things,) any one may see in it the glorious doctrine of the

παρα ἁγίων πατερων, τουτεστι των ἁγίων Αποστολων, πιστιν φυλαττειν. Ancorat. (Ed. Par. 1622. vol. ii. p. 122.)—And Jerome says,—“Patriarchas quoque et Prophetas (si tamen nos ab eis peccata non separent) nostros patres dicimus.” In Eph. lib. ii. c. 3. tom. vii. col. 601. Ed. Vall. Ven. See also August. De Trin. lib. 2. c. 9. tom. viii. col. 781.

¹ B. Ως δεινον γε, ω των, το χρημα, και δυσδιαφυκτος αληθως ἡ της δυσσεβειας γραφη. Α. Ευδιαφυκτος μεν ουν εφειται γαρ δη τοις εβελουσιν ευκολως αποφοιταν, και τον ολετηρα και φθορον των διεναντίας διωθεισθαι λογον, το χρηναι νικαν απονεμουσιν ευσεβως ταις των ἁγίων φωναίς. De S. Trin. Dial. 4. Ib. p. 505.

² Τις ουν αν γενοιτο λοιπον της επιδημίας ο λογος, η τις ο τροπος της ενανθρωπησεως; πεπρακται δε οτου χαριν, ει τις εροιτο τυχον, αντακουσεται παρ’ ἡμων ἡ θεια διδαξει γραφη. Ιθι δη, ουν, ω γενναιε, πυθου των ἱερων γραμματων, και ταις των ἁγίων Αποστολων φωναίς ενερειςας ευ μαλα της διανοιας τον οφθαλμον, αθρει δη καλως το ζητουμενον. De recta fide ad Theodos. tom. v. P. 2. p. 17. The observation is to be found also in his “De incarn. Unigen. Dial.” Tom. v. P. 1. p. 691.

true knowledge of God. . . . Moreover, in addition to this, it teaches us how to order aright our life and conversation, and by its divine and sacred laws directs us in the way of righteousness, and makes the path of all equity clear to us.”¹

Lastly, as it respects the interpretation of Scripture, he gives such rules as these,—“It behoves him who enters upon the investigation of the divine Scriptures to observe the time at which what is revealed is said, and the person by whom or through whom, or of whom, it is spoken; for thus they who wish rightly to understand may be preserved from error, and obtain a correct view of its meaning.”² Such are the directions which he gives Christians for ascertaining the meaning of Scripture.

It remains for our opponents to show where he sends us to “tradition” as the necessary and infallible interpreter of Scripture.

ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM (fl. a. 412.)

“The sacred volumes of the divine Scriptures,” says Isidore of Pelusium,” are steps whereby we ascend to God.”³

“If God had had respect only to his own dignity, and not the profit of the reader, he would have used heavenly and divine words and examples. But since he was legislating for men that are weak and in need of human words

¹ Αποχρη μεν ουν η θεοπνευστος γραφη, και προς γε το δειν αποφαναι σοφους και δοκιμωτατους, και διαρκεστατην εχοντας συνεσιεν τους εντεθραμμενους αυτη. . . . Τι των ονησιφορων ουκ ειρηται παρ' αυτης; πρωτον μεν γαρ, ο και των αλλων απαντων εστι τιμαλφεστερον, κατιδοι τις εν αυτη τους της αληθους θεοπτιας εναστραπτοντας λογους εϊτα προς τουτοις και τους της ευζωϊας ημιν εισηγηται τροπους, νομοις δε θειοις και ιεροις απευθυνει προς δικαιοσυνην, και μην και απασης ημιν επιεικειας εναργη καθιστησι τριβον. Contr. Julian. lib. vii. p. 230. tom. vi. See also pp. 231, 2.

² Πρωτον μεν ουν προσηκει τον εις ερευναν θειων εισβαινοντα γραφων, τον καιρον επιτηρειν καθ' ον λεγεται το δηλουμενον, και προσωπον παρ' ου η δι' ου, η περι ου λεγεται ουτω γαρ αν απλανης η διανοια φυλαχθειη τοις ορθως θελουσι νοειν. Thesaurus, tom. v. P. 1. p. 199.

³ Αι δε ιεραι πτυκται των μαρτυρουμενων θειων γραφων της προς Θεον εισιν αναβασιως κλιμακες. ISIDOR. PELUS. Ep. lib. i. Ep. 369. p. 96.

(for thus they were able easily to understand things above them), he expressed his divine doctrines in common words, to the intent that even a woman and a child, and the most ignorant of all men, might obtain some profit even from the very hearing. For the word having a consideration for the salvation of the multitude, and even rustics, is expressed with so much clearness through the philanthropy of the legislator, as to deprive no one of the benefit proportioned to his powers; nor hath it neglected the wiser of mankind; for in this so great clearness, such unutterable words dwell like treasures, that even the wisest and most learned of men are lost in the profundity of the thoughts, and often confess themselves overcome by the incomprehensibility of the wisdom.”¹

“If the truth be joined to eloquent language, it is able to profit the educated, but to all others it will be of no use or advantage. Wherefore the Scripture hath declared the truth in simple language, that both the unlearned and the wise, and even children and women, might learn it. For by this the wise are in no respect injured; but by the other [i. e. Scripture being indited in superior language] the greater part of the world would have been injured; and if it behoved it to consider the few, it more especially behoved it to consider the many; and since it has considered all, it is clearly shown to be divine and heavenly.”²

¹ Εἰ γὰρ πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀξίαν μόνον προσέσχεν ὁ Θεός, καὶ μὴ πρὸς τὴν ὠφελίαν τῶν ἐντευξομένων, οὐρανόιοι ἀν καὶ θείοιοι λόγοιοι τε καὶ παραδείγμασι ἐχρησάτο. Ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ ἀνθρώποιοι ἐνομοθετεῖ ἀσθενέσι τυγχάνουσι, καὶ ἀνθρώπων δεομένοιοι λόγων (οὕτω γὰρ ῥαδίως τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς νοῆσαι ἡδυνάντο) ἰδιωτικαῖς λέξεσιν ἐκεράσε τὰ θεῖα μῦθιματα, ἵνα καὶ γυνὴ καὶ παῖς καὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀμαθεστάτοιοι κερδῶν τι καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀκροασέωιοι τῆς γὰρ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἀγέλαιοτερων φροντίσας σωτηρίας ὁ λόγος, σαφηνεία τοσαύτη διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν τοῦ νομοθετοῦ κραθεῖοι, οὐδὲνα τῆς κατὰ δύναμιν ὠφελείας ἀποστέρει· οὐτε δὲ τῶν σοφωτερων ἡμελησέν· ἐν τοσαύτῃ γὰρ σαφηνεία οὕτως ἀπορητοῖοι λόγοιοι καθάπερ θησαυροῖοι τινεοι ἐνοικουσιν, ὥς καὶ τοὺς σοφωτάτοιοι καὶ ἐλλογιμωτάτοιοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ βάθος τῶν νοημάτων ἱλιγγίαν, καὶ παραχωρεῖοι πολλακίς τῷ ἀκατάληπτῷ τῆς σοφίας. Id. Ib. lib. ii. Epist. 5. p. 129.

² Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια τῇ καλλιεπείᾳ συναφθῇ, δύναται μὲν τοὺς πεπαιδευμένοιοι ὠφελεῖοι, τοῖοι δὲ ἀλλοῖοι ἅπασιν ἀχρηστόιοι ἐστὰι καὶ ἀνωφελῆς. Δι’ ὁ καὶ ἡ

"The sacred and heavenly oracles, since they were spoken and written for the benefit of all mankind, were expressed in plain language. . . . All those who are engaged in husbandry, and the arts, and other occupations of life, derive profit from its clearness ; learning both what is proper and what is just and what is useful in a moment of time."¹

And, lastly, he says,—“ If all things were plain, where should we make use of our understanding, there not being any investigation to make? But if all things were obscure, thus also we should fall, there being no discovery of the truth. But now, *through those parts that are plain, those that are obscure are in a manner understood.*”²

THEODORET (fl. a. 423.)

We pass on to one of the most learned of the Greek Fathers, Theodoret ; from whom we have the following testimonies as to the suitability and power of Scripture to teach the faith.

“ The divine Scripture,” he says, “ is accustomed to accommodate its lessons to those who are to be instructed ; and to the perfect, to offer that which is perfect ; and to the ignorant, elementary points and things suited to their ability.”³

γραφη την αληθειαν πεζῷ λογῷ ἡρμηνευσεν, ἵνα καὶ ἰδιῳται καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ παῖδες καὶ γυναῖκες μαθοῖεν. Ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τούτου οἱ μὲν σοφοὶ οὐδὲν παραβλαπτοῦνται· ἐκ δὲ ἐκείνου τὸ πλεον τῆς οἰκουμένης μέρος προεβλαβή· ἀν τινῶν οὖν ἐχρην φροντισαί, μάλιστα μὲν τῶν πλειονῶν. Ἐπειδὴν δὲ καὶ πάντων ἐφροντίσεν, δεικνύται λαμπρῶς θεία οὐσα καὶ οὐρανίως. Ib. lib. iv. Ep. 67. p. 449.

¹ Οἱ ἱεροὶ καὶ οὐρανιοὶ χρῆσμοι, ἐπειδὴν πρὸς ὠφελείαν πάσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ἐρρήθησαν καὶ ἐγραφήσαν, τῇ σαφηνείᾳ ἐκράθησαν . . . πάντες οἱ γεωργίαις καὶ τεχναῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαῖς ἀσχολίαις τοῦ βίου σχολάζοντες, ὠφελοῦνται ἐκ τῆς σαφηνείας· καὶ τὸ πρεπον καὶ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἐν ἀκαρίαᾳ καίρῳ ροπή μανθάνοντες. Ib. lib. iv. Ep. 91. p. 461.

² Εἰ μὲν γὰρ πάντα ἦν δηλα, πού τῃ συνέσει ἐχρησάμεθα, μὴ οὐσης ζήτησεως ; εἰ δὲ πάντα ἀδηλα, καὶ οὕτως ἀναπεπτωκείμεν ἂν, μὴ οὐσης εὕρεσεως. νυν δὲ διὰ τῶν δηλῶν καὶ τὰ ἀδηλα τρόπον τινὰ καταλαμβάνεται. Ib. lib. iv. Ep. 82. p. 458.

³ Μέτρειν εἰώθε τοῖς παιδευομένοις ἢ θεία γραφή τὰ μαθήματα· καὶ τοῖς μὲν τελείοις προσφέρειν τὰ τελεία, τοῖς ἀτελεσι δὲ τὰ στοιχειώδη, καὶ τῇ σφῶν δυνάμει συμβαίνοντα. THEODORET. Quæst. in Gen. q. 1. tom. i. p. 3.

“The divine Scripture accommodates its language to men ; and orders its words so that they may be able to understand.”¹

“Some persons having become affected with this *disease of mind*, have undertaken to accuse the divine Scripture, and especially the prophecies, as if they were *obscure*. To whom the divine Paul would say, ‘But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost;’ for ‘we speak wisdom among them that are perfect.’ And agreeable to these are the words spoken by our Master and Saviour to the holy Apostles, ‘To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom, but to them it is not given.’ And teaching them the cause of this, he directly adds, ‘For seeing they see not, and hearing they do not understand;’ for they, saith he, willingly draw upon themselves the cloud of ignorance; for if they had turned to the Lord, as the divine Apostle says, the veil would be removed. Therefore the divine oracles are *not obscure to all*, but *only to those who are willingly blind*. LET NO ONE THEREFORE, AND ESPECIALLY AMONG THE PUPILS OF PIETY, BE SO BOLD AGAINST THE DIVINE SPIRIT AS TO CHARGE HIS WORDS WITH OBSCURITY; but earnestly seeking to understand the sacred words, let him exclaim with the divine David, ‘Open thou mine eyes, and I shall behold wondrous things out of thy law.’ For he who seeks this knowledge for his profit shall assuredly obtain his request.”²

¹ Προσφορως τοις ανθρωποις ἡ θεια γραφη διαλεγεται· και ὡς ακουειν δυναται μετασχηματιζει τους λογους, Id. ib. q. 52. tom. i. p. 65.

² Ταυτη περιπεσοντες τη νοσω τινες της θειας γραφης κατηγορειν επεχειρησαν, διαφεροντως δε των προφητικων θεσπισματων ὡς ασαφεια κεκαλυμμενων. Προσ οὓς αν εικотως ὁ θεσπεσιος ειποι Παυλος· ει δε και εστι κεκαλυμμενον το ευαγγελιον ἡμων, εν τοις απολλυμενοις εστι κεκαλυμμενον· σοφιαν γαρ λαλουμεν εν τελειοις. Συμφωνει δε τουτοις και τα ὑπο του Δεσποτου και Σωτηρος ἡμων προς τους ἁγιους Αποστολους ειρημενα. Ὑμιν δεδοται γνωσαι τα μυστηρια της βισιλειας, εκεινοις δε ου δεδοται· και την αιτιαν διδασκων ευθυσ επαγει. Ὅτι βλέποντες ου βλέπουσι, και ακουοντες ου συνιουσιν· αυτοι γαρ φησιν ἐκοντες επισπωνται της αγνοιας το νεφος· εαν γαρ επιστρεψωσι προς Κυριον, η φησιν ὁ θειος Αποστολος, περιαιρεται το καλυμμα. Ου τοιουν πασιν εστιν ασαφη τα θεια, αλλα τοις εθελουσις τυφλωττουσιν Μηδεις τοιουν, και μαλιστα των της ευσεβειας

And he gives the following reason for the *occasional* obscurity of Scripture. "There are occasions when the divine revelations are spoken and written ænigmatically, that those things which are revealed to the saints may not be manifest to all. For thus, if they were equally discerned by all, they would become objects of contempt." ¹

Further, he says,—“For the things of which we are ignorant we learn from the inspired Scripture.” ²

Again ; “For as great as is the difference between God and the devil, so great is the difference between the teaching of God and that of the devil. And the beauty of the divine oracles *sending forth the beams of a light suited to the faculties of man*, when compared with those fables, will more clearly show this.” ³

And throughout the work from which this extract is taken, viz. that on heretical fables, as well as in other places, he continually refers to the divine Scripture, and to that only, as his *teacher* in the doctrines he inculcates.

Again ; he says,—“For all the preachers of the truth, the prophets and apostles I mean, were not possessed of the Grecian eloquence, but being full of the true wisdom brought to all the heathen, both Greeks and barbarians, the divine doctrine, and filled the whole earth and sea with their writings concerning virtue and piety. And now all men have left the follies of the philosophers and

τροφιμῶν, κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ Πνεύματος θρασυνέσθω, τοῖς τούτου λόγοις ἀσάφειαν ἐπιμεμφομενός· ἀλλὰ νοῆσαι τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἐφιεμένους λόγους μετὰ τοῦ θεοσπείσιον βασιτῆως Δαβὶδ· ἀποκαλύψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσια ἐκ τοῦ νομοῦ σου· τεύχεται γὰρ παντὶς τῆς αἰτήσεως, ἐπ’ ὠφελείᾳ τὴν γνῶσιν ἐπαγγέλσας. Id. in Ezech. Præf. tom. ii. pp. 670—2.

¹ Αἰνιγματῶδες δὲ ἐστὶν ὅτε τὰ θεῖα λέγεται καὶ γραφεται, ἵνα μὴ πᾶσι ἡ δὴλα τὰ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποκαλυπτομένα· οὕτω γὰρ ἀν’ ευκαταφρόνητα ἐγεγονεὶ ὁμοίως ὑπο πάντων γνωριζόμενα. Id. in Dan. c. 9. tom. ii. p. 1238.

² Ἄ γὰρ ἀγνοοῦμεν, ἐκεῖθεν [i. e. ἐκ θεοπνευστοῦ γραφῆς] μανθανομεν. Id. in 2 Tim. iii. 16. tom. iii. p. 691.

³ Ὅσον γὰρ Θεοῦ καὶ διαβολοῦ το μεσον, τοσαύτη τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διαβολοῦ διδασκαλίας διαφορὰ· καὶ τούτου δεῖξει σαφέστερον τοῖς μυθοῖς ἐκεῖνοις παρατιθεμένον τῶν θεῶν λόγων το καλλος, τὰς τοῦ νοεροῦ φωτὸς ἐκπεμπον μαρμαρυγὰς. Id. Hær. Fab. lib. v. Præf. tom. iv. p. 377.

take delight in the lessons of fishermen and publicans, and reverence the writings of a shoemaker. They are acquainted with Matthew and Bartholomew and James, nay, moreover, with Moses and David and Isaiah, and the rest of the Apostles and Prophets, as familiarly as with the names of their children. And straightway they laugh at their names as barbarous. But we lament over their madness ; in that, seeing the Grecian eloquence overcome by men of a barbarous tongue, and their beautifully composed fables altogether put to flight, and the Attic syllogisms destroyed by the solecisms of fishermen, they do not blush nor hide themselves, but impudently fight for their error But we clearly demonstrate the power of the apostolical and prophetical doctrines, for all places under the sun are full of these discourses. . . And we may see not only the teachers of the Church acquainted with these doctrines, but even shoemakers and smiths and workers in wool, and other handy-craftsmen, and in like manner women, not only the educated, but also those who work for their living, both needle-women and moreover servant-girls. And not only those who live in cities, but also those who live in the country, have obtained this knowledge. And you may find even ditchers and herdsmen and gardeners conversing respecting the divine Trinity, and concerning the creation of the universe, and knowing much more of human nature than Aristotle and Plato; and, moreover, having a regard for virtue and avoiding vice, and fearing the looked-for punishments, and awaiting without doubts the divine tribunal, and philosophizing respecting the life that is eternal and indestructible, and for the sake of the kingdom of heaven gladly undertaking every kind of labour, and WHO HAVE LEARNT THESE THINGS FROM NO ONE ELSE BUT FROM THOSE WHOM YOU CALL BARBARIAN-TONGUED.”¹

¹ Καὶ γὰρ ἅπαντες τῆς ἀληθείας οἱ κηρυκὲς, προφηταὶ φημι καὶ ἀποστολοὶ, τῆς μὲν Ἑλληνικῆς οὐ μετέλαχον εὐγλωττίας· ἐμπλεοὶ δὲ τῆς ἀληθείης ὄντες σοφίας, πασι τοῖς ἐθνεσὶ, καὶ ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ βαρβαρικοῖς τὴν θείαν διδασκαλίαν προσή-

Again, in one of his Letters, he says,—“For the sake of this we are accustomed from our cradles to meditate upon the sacred Scripture, and draw from it as from a breast, that when affliction comes upon us we may apply the Spirit’s teaching as a healing medicine.”¹

Lastly, in the sermons attributed by some to Theodoret, but by others to Eutharius, we meet with the following passage. Speaking of those who neglected the study of the Scriptures, the writer adds,—“But we, confiding in the truth of the mystery, and in the aid of him who cannot lie, who says, ‘Every one that seeketh findeth,’ both seek as we ought, and find what we ought, and speak with demonstration, and hear with a sincere purpose of mind, so that we may persuade those that belong to us, and convince our adversaries, and enrich ourselves by the search,

νεγκαν' και πασαν γην και θαλασσαν των αρετης περι και ευσεβειας ξυγγραμματον ενεπλησαν. Και νυν απαντες, των φιλοσοφων τους ληρους καταλιποντες, τοις των αλιων και τελωνων εντροφωσι μαθημασι, και τα του σκυτοτομου ξυγγραμματα περιεπουσι Τον Ματθαιον και τον Βαρβολομαιον και τον Ιακωβον, και μεντοι τον Μωυσηα, και τον Δαβιδ, και τον Ησαιαν, και τους αλλους αποστολους τε και προφητας, ουτως ισασιν ως τας των παιδων προσηγοριας. Αυτικα τοιουν και κωμωδουσιν ως βαρβαρα τα ονοματα' ημεις δε αυτων την εμπληξιν ολοφυρομεθα' οτι δη ουραντες βαρβαροφωνους ανθρωπους την ελληνικην ευγλωττιαν νενικηκotas, και τους κεκομψευμενους μυθους παντελως εξεληλαμενους, και τους αλιευτικους σολοικισμους τους αττικους καταελυκotas ξυλλογισμους, ουκ ερυθριουσιν, ουδ' εγκαλυπτονται, αλλ' αναιδην υπερμαχουσι της πλανης. . . . 'Ημεις δε των αποστολικων και προφητικων δογματων το κρατος εναργως επιδεικνυμεν' πιασα γαρ η ύψηλιος τωνδε των λογων αναπλεως. Και εστιν ιδειν ταυτα ειδotas τα δογματα, ου μονους γε της εκκλησιας τους διδασκαλους, αλλα και σκυτοτομους, και χαλκοτυπους, και ταλασιουργους, και τους αλλους αποχειριβιωτους' και γυναικας ωσαντως, ου μονον τας λογων μετεσχηκνιαις, αλλα και χερνητιδας, και ακεστριδας, και μεντοι και θεραπαινας' και ου μονον αστοι αλλα και χωρητικοι τηνδε την γνωσιν εσχηκασι' και εστιν εύρειν και σκαπανεας, και βοηλατας, και φυτουργους περι της θειας διαλεγομενους Τριαδος, και περι της των ύλων δημιουργιας, και την ανθρωπειαν φυσιν ειδotas Αριστοτελους πολλω μαλλον και Πλατωνος' και μεντοι και αρετης επιμελουμενους, και κακιαν εκκλινοντας, και τα κολαστηρια δεδιotas τα προσδοκωμενα, και το θειον δικαστηριον ανενδοιαστως προσμενοντας, και της αιωνιου περι και ανωλεθρου φιλοσοφουντας ζωης, και των ουρανων ένεκα βασιλειαις παντα πονον ασπασίως αίρουμενους' και ταυτι, ου παρ' αλλου του μεμαθηκotas, αλλα παρ' εκεινων ους ημεις βαρβαροφωνους αποκαλειτε. Id. Græc. affect. Curatio. Disp. 5. tom. iv. pp. 837—41.

¹ Τουτου γαρ δη χαριν ευθως εκ σπαργωνων οϊον τινα θηλην ελκομεν της ιερας γραφης την μελετην, ίν' όταν ημιν προσπεση παθος, προσενεγκωμεν αλεξικακον φαρμακον την διδασκαλιαν του Πνευματος. Id. Epist. 14. tom. iv. p. 1072.

and not propose inconsistent doctrine. *Shall I neglect the Scriptures? Whence then shall I obtain knowledge? Shall I relinquish knowledge? Whence, then, shall I obtain faith?* The Scripture is the food of the soul. . . . By the holy Scriptures is the manifestation of things hidden, the establishment of our hopes, the fulfilment of the promises, the discovery of the Saviour. . . . *But they who desire to be themselves the judges of their own doctrines, drive us from the Scriptures, under the pretext of not being presumptuous, as if they were incomprehensible, but in reality in order to avoid being convicted by them of their own false doctrine.”*¹

FULGENTIUS OF RUSPA (fl. a. 507.)

“The word of the Lord,” says Fulgentius, “which we all ought to hear not only attentively but wisely, and which we ought to obey with humility and delight, everywhere preserving the balance of its moderation, so that neither the sheep might be without pasture, nor the shepherds without food, gives some commands specially to us alone, and some generally both to us and you. For to us, that is the servants whom that Father of the family, the Lord of all things, has appointed for this purpose in his great house, that we should minister the word of grace to his people, is specially enjoined the duty of holy preaching; but generally both to us and you there

Ἡμεῖς θαρρύντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τοῦ μυστηρίου, καὶ τῇ βοήθειᾳ τοῦ ἀψευδούς εἰπόντος, Πας ὁ ζήτων εὕρισκει, καὶ ζητοῦμεν ὡς δεῖ, καὶ εὕρισκομεν ἃ δεῖ, καὶ μετὰ ἀποδείξεως λεγομένη, καὶ μετὰ προθέσεως γνησίας ἀκούομεν, ὡς καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους πείθειν, καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐλεγχεῖν, καὶ ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς διὰ τῆς ἐρευνῆς κερδαίνειν, καὶ μὴ ἀσυστάτον πρᾶγμα δεῖκνυειν. Ἀμελήσω γραφῶν; ποθεν οὖν ἡ γνῶσις. Καταλείψω γνῶσιν; ποθεν ἡ πίστις; . . . Τροφή ψυχῆς ἡ γραφή. . . Ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν ἡ τῶν ἀδελῶν φανερώσις, ἡ τῶν ἐλπίδων βεβαιώσις, ἡ τῶν ὑποσχέσεων ἐκβάσις, ἡ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εὕρεσις. . . Ἀλλ’ οἱ βουλομένοι τα ἑαυτῶν κρίνειν ἀπειργουσι τῶν γραφῶν, προφασίει μὲν τοῦ μὴ κατατολμᾶν ὡς ἀπροσίτων τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ ὑπὲρ τοῦ φεγγεῖν τὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐλεγχον τῆς οἰκείας κακοδοξίας. THEODOR. seu EUTHERII Serm. 2. tom. v. pp. 1124—6. This homily has been attributed to Athanasius. See Athanas. Op. ed. Ben. tom. ii. pp. 562, 3. ed. Col. tom. ii. pp. 295, 6.

is enjoined a salutary obedience to his commands. In which commands, as in most plentiful dishes, a spiritual supply of heavenly delights so abounds, that in the word of God there is ample provision for the perfect to eat, and *ample provision for the little one to suck*. For there is both the milky drink, by which the tender infancy of the faithful may be nourished, and the solid food from which the robust youth of the perfect may receive a spiritual increase of holy virtue. *There provision is fully made for the salvation of those whom the Lord vouchsafes to save*; there is to be found what is *suitable to every age*, there what is agreeable to every profession; there we hear the precepts we ought to obey, there we learn the rewards we may expect; there is the command which *teaches us in the letter*, and leads us to knowledge; there the promise which draws us through grace and leads us to glory.”¹

GREGORY (fl. a. 590.)

We conclude, as before, with the testimony of the celebrated Gregory.

“The divine word,” he says, “as by its mysteries it exercises the wise, so for the most part it cherishes the

¹ Dominicus sermo, quem debemus omnes non solum studiose verum etiam sapienter audire, cui nos oportet humiliter ac delectabiliter obedire, moderationis suæ tenens ubique temperiem, ut nec ovibus desint pabula nec pastoribus alimenta: quædam specialiter solis præcipit nobis, quædam vero generaliter et nobis et vobis. Nobis namque, id est servis, quos pater ille familias rerum omnium dominus, ad hoc in sua magna domo constituit, ut populo ejus verbum gratiæ ministremus, specialiter injungitur sanctæ prædicationis officium; generaliter vero nobis et vobis salutaris indicitur obedientia mandatorum. In quibus denuo mandatis, tanquam ditissimis ferculis, sic cœlestium deliciarum copia spiritalis exuberat, ut in verbo Dei abundet quod perfectus comedat, abundet etiam quod parvulus sugat. Ibi est enim simul et lacteus potus, quo tenera fidelium nutriatur infantia, et solidus cibus, quo robusta perfectorum juvenus spiritalia sanctæ virtutis accipiat incrementa. Ibi prorsus ad salutem consulitur universis quos Dominus salvare dignatur; ibi est quod omni ætati congruat, ibi quod omni professioni conveniat; ibi audimus præcepta quæ faciamus, ibi cognoscimus præmia quæ speremus; ibi est jussio quæ nos per litteram doceat, et instruat ad scientiam; ibi promissio quæ per gratiam trahat et perducatur ad gloriam. FULGENTII Serm. De Dispensat. Dom. Serm. 1. (Op. ed. Ven. 1742. p. 248.)

simple by that which it contains on the surface. It openly exposes that by which it may nourish the little ones, it keeps secret that by which it may hold the minds of the lofty in admiration. It is, so to speak, like a river that is smooth and deep, in which both *a lamb may wade*, and an elephant may swim.”¹

And for its occasional obscurity he thus assigns the cause;—“The very obscurity of the oracles of God is of great use, because it exercises the understanding, that it may be expanded by the labour, and may understand when in exercise that which it could not understand when idle. It has also another greater advantage, inasmuch as the understanding of the sacred Scripture, which, if *in all points* it were free from difficulty, would be held cheap, gives the mind, when found in *certain more obscure passages*, so much greater pleasure as in the search it fatigues the mind with greater labour.”² It is not “tradition,” then, to which we are directed to teach us the meaning of the obscure passages, but a more careful and attentive examination of them.

Upon the strength of these testimonies, then, we maintain that the weight of patristical testimony is beyond dispute in our favour. The clearness, indeed, with which most of the Fathers have asserted the view for which we contend, makes it a matter of surprise that any one at all acquainted with their writings should venture to claim them as opposed to it.

¹ Divinus etenim sermo sicut mysteriis prudentes exercet, sic plerumque superficie simplices refovet. Habet in publico unde parvulos nutriat; servat in secreto unde mentes sublimium in admiratione suspendat. Quasi quidam quippe est fluvius, ut ita dixerim, planus et altus, in quo et agnus ambulet et elephas natet. GREG. M. Epist. ad Leand. præfix. ad Moral. sive Expos. in Job, tom. i. col. 5, 6.

² Magnæ utilitatis est ipsa obscuritas eloquiorum Dei, quia exercet sensum, ut fatigatione dilatetur, et exercitatus capiat quod capere non posset otiosus. Habet quoque adhuc aliud majus, quia Scripturæ sacræ intelligentia, quæ si in cunctis esset aperta vilesceret, in quibusdam locis obscurioribus tanto majore dulcedine inventa reficit, quanto majore labore fatigat animum quæsita. Id. In Ezech. lib. i. hom. 6. Op. tom. i. col. 1213.

There remains, however, one more point in the system of our opponents, respecting which we have to inquire the sentiments of the Fathers; to which I now proceed.

SECT. VI.—WHETHER PATRISTICAL TRADITION IS THE GROUND
UPON WHICH OUR BELIEF IN THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE
MUST BE FOUNDED.

There remains for consideration the question, Upon what grounds the Fathers considered that belief in the inspiration of Scripture should rest. I have said, in a former page,¹ that they did not make Church-tradition the ground for belief in this doctrine; and I shall now endeavour to show the truth of this, by citing various passages from the works of some of the most eminent among them, in which the grounds for belief in this doctrine are pointed out; and a very different view taken of the subject, to that maintained by our opponents.

JUSTIN MARTYR (fl. a. 140.)

Let us observe, first, the ground upon which Justin Martyr makes his faith in Scripture as the word of God, to rest; and which he proposes to others, as a proper foundation for their faith in it as such.

In his Dialogue with Trypho and his companions, he gives an account of the mode of his conversion; and attributes it to a conversation with an aged and venerable person, whom he had fallen in with in a solitary place, to which he had retired for the purpose of meditation. Giving the details of this conversation, he says that, when he put the question, how he might attain the knowledge of the truth, if not in philosophy, his venerable Christian instructor gave him this answer. "There were certain men, a long time since, more antient than all those called philosophers, blessed and just men, and lovers of God,

¹ Vol. i. p. 468.

who spoke under the influence of the Divine Spirit, and prophesied of things that were to come, which things are now in the course of fulfilment; and men call them prophets. These alone saw and declared to men the truth, neither regarding with undue respect, nor dreading, any one, not overcome by the desire of glory, but speaking those things only which they heard and saw, being filled with the Holy Spirit. And their books still remain to the present time; and he who reads and believes them, is very greatly improved in knowledge, respecting both the beginning and end of things, and whatever it behoves a philosopher to know. For they did not write in the way of demonstration, as being placed above the necessity of any demonstration as faithful witnesses of the truth. And the things which have come to pass, and are now happening, compel men to believe the things spoken by them. And moreover they were worthy to be believed, on account of the miracles which they wrought; since they also glorified God, the Maker of the Universe, and Father of all, and preached Christ his Son, who was sent by him; which the false prophets, influenced by a spirit of error and impurity, neither did nor do; but presume to work certain miracles to frighten men, and glorify spirits of error and devils. But pray that, above all things, the gates of light may be opened to thee. For these things are not seen nor understood by all, but only by him, to whom God and his Christ grant the knowledge of them.”¹ “And [adds Justin] having considered with myself his words, I

¹ Εγενοντο τινες προ πολλου χρονου παντων τουτων των νομιζομενων φιλοσοφων παλαιστοι, μακαριοι και δικαιοι, και θεοφιλεις, θειω πνευματι λαλησαντες, και τα μελλοντα θεσπισαντες, α̅ δη νυν γινεται̅ προφητας δε αυτους καλουσιν̅ ουτοι μονοι το αληθες και ειδον και εξειπον ανθρωποις, μητ̅ ευλαβηθεντες μητε δυσωπηθεντες τινα, μη ηττημενοι δοξης, αλλα μονα ταυτα ειποντες α̅ ηκουσαν και α̅ ειδον, α̅ γιω πληρωθεντες πνευματι̅ συγγραμματα δε αυτων ετι και νυν διαμενει, και εστιν εντυχοντα τουτοις πλειστον ωφεληθηναι και περι αρχων και περι τελους, και ων χρη ειδεναι τον φιλοσοφον, πιστευσαντα εκεινοις. Ου γαρ μετα αποδειξεως πεποινηται τοτε τους λογους, α̅τε ανωτερω πωσης αποδειξεως ορτες αξιοπιστοι μαρτυρες της αληθειας̅ τα δε αποβαιντα και αποβαινοντα εξαγαγκαζει συντιθεσθαι τοις λελαλημενοις δι̅ αυτων̅ και τοι γε και δια τας δυναμεις α̅ς επετελουν, πιστευσθαι δικαιοι ησαν̅ επειδη και τον ποιητην των ολων Θεον και πατερα εδοξαζον, και τον παρ̅ αυτου

found that this is the only safe and profitable philosophy; and thus, in truth, through these things, I became a philosopher. And I could wish that all having brought themselves to the same state of mind, would not stand aloof from the words of the Saviour, for *they have a certain majesty in themselves, and are sufficient to alarm those who turn from the right way; and give most sweet peace to those who are conversant with them.*"¹

It appears that Justin was more particularly directed by his instructor to the writings of the prophets, in order, no doubt, to afford him the evidence which the fulfilment of those prophecies gives to the truth of Christianity; and that in them he clearly perceived the doctrine of Christ; and this doctrine he afterwards exhibits to Trypho and his companions, by extracts from their writings. The excellence of the doctrine of the sacred writers, and the evidence afforded to it by the fulfilment of their predictions and their miracles, convinced him, when a heathen, of the divine origin of the revelations, both of the Old and New Testaments; and by showing Trypho and his companions the true meaning of the prophetic writings, and the doctrine of Christ, as contained in them, he hoped to bring them to the belief of the New.

And further on, in reply to an objection of Trypho, that he had suffered himself to be misled, he says, "I will show, if you will stay with me, that we have not believed empty fables, nor words incapable of demonstration, but

Χριστον υἱόν αὐτοῦ καταγγέλλον· ὅπερ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ πλάνου καὶ ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος ἐπιπλάμενοι ψευδοπροφηταὶ οὔτε ποιοῦσιν, οὔτε ποιουσιν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει τινας ἐνεργεῖν εἰς καταπλήξιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τολμῶσι, καὶ τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμονία δοξολογοῦσιν. Εὐχου δὲ σοὶ προ πάντων φῶτος ανοιχθῆναι πύλας· οὐ γὰρ συνοπτα οὐδὲ συννοητὰ πᾶσιν ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ τῷ Θεῷ συνιέναι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ. JUST. MART. Dial. cum Tryph. § 7. p. 109. (Ed. Col. pp. 224, 5.)

¹ Διαλογιζόμενος τε πρὸς ἑμᾶν τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ, ταύτην μὲν εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλὴν τε καὶ συμφερόν, οὕτως δὲ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα φιλόσοφος ἐγώ. Βουλομένη δ' ἂν καὶ πάντα ἴσοι ἐμοὶ θυμὸν ποιησαμένους, μὴ ἀφίστασθαι τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος λόγων, δεὸς γὰρ τι ἐχουσιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἱκανοὶ δυνάμεισθαι τοὺς ἐκτρεπομένους τῆς ὀρθῆς ὁδοῦ, ἀναπαύειν τε ἡδίστη γίνεται τοῖς ἐκμελετώσιν αὐτοὺς. Id. ib. § 8. p. 109. (Ed. Col. p. 225.)

such as are *full of a divine spirit, and overflowing with power, and flourishing with grace.*"¹ Here, then, he distinctly makes the internal excellence of the doctrine of the New Testament, the ground for our belief that it is a divine doctrine; and that, consequently, they who first delivered it, were divinely inspired.

Again, in his "Exhortation to the Greeks," he adopts the same line of argument. For having shown them, on various grounds, how little their philosophers were to be trusted, and particularly from their all differing one from another, he points out to them the harmony which there is in the writings of our teachers, who, he says, "*having received the truth from God, taught it us without disputing with one another, and separating into parties. For it was not possible for men to know such great and divine things by nature, or human meditation, but by a gift, which came down at that time from above upon holy men.*"²

And further on, tracing the doctrines of the Christian faith, as in his Dialogue with Trypho, in the writings of the Old Testament, he says,—"*But if any one of those accustomed hastily to oppose us, should affirm that these books belong not to us, but to the Jews, because they are still preserved in their synagogues, and should say that we assert in vain that we have learnt our religion from them, let him know from the things written in those books, that the doctrine derived from them concerns not them, but us. And that the books which relate to our religion are yet preserved among the Jews, is the work of a divine providence in our behalf. For that we may not, by producing them from the Church, afford a pretext to those who are desirous of bearing witness against us, for accusing us of fraud, we think it best to*

¹ Παρεστῶτι γὰρ δεῖξω, ὅτι οὐ κενοῖς ἐπιστευσάμεν μυθοῖς, οὐδὲ ἀναποδείκτοις λόγοις, ἀλλὰ μεστοῖς Πνεύματος θεοῦ καὶ δυνάμει βρῦνουνσι, καὶ τεθηλοῖσι χαρίτι. *Id. ib. § 9. p. 110. (Ed. Col. p. 226.)*

² Αφιλονεικῶς καὶ μετασυστάως τὴν παρὰ Θεοῦ δεξαμένους γῶνσιν, καὶ ταύτην δ.δασκόντας ἡμᾶς· οὐτε γὰρ φύσει, οὐτε ἀνθρωπινῇ ἐννοίᾳ οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θεία γινώσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἀνδράς τηλικαύτα κατελθούσῃ δῶ, εἰ. *Id. Ad Græc. Cohort. § 8. pp. 12, 13. (Ed. Col. p. 9.)*

produce them from the synagogue of the Jews, that it may appear, from the very books yet preserved among them, that the precepts relating to doctrine, written by those holy men, clearly and manifestly belong to us."¹ So that, as it respects the Old Testament, he prefers the testimony of the Jews to that of the Christian Church, a testimony which we have to this day; and from the Old Testament we may, as it appeared to him, derive sufficient testimony for the divine origin of the doctrines of the New.

In both his Apologies, moreover, he follows the same course; placing his proof of the divine origin of the doctrines he was defending, either upon the internal testimony derived from their intrinsic excellence,² or upon such proofs as the fulfilment of the prophecies, both of the Old and New Testament.³

And lastly, in his Oration to the Greeks, having apostrophised "the divine word" as "the putter to flight of evil passions, the doctrine that extinguishes the fire of the soul, &c."⁴ he adds, "Come and be instructed; be as I am, for I was as ye are; *These things persuaded me, namely, the divinity of the doctrine, and the power of the word.*"⁵

¹ Εἰ δὲ τις φασκοὶ τῶν προχειρῶς ἀντιλεγεῖν εἰθισμένων, μὴ ἡμῖν τὰς βιβλοὺς ταύτας, ἀλλὰ Ἰουδαίῳ προσήκειν, διὰ τοῦ ἐτι καὶ νῦν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν σωζεσθαι, καὶ ματὴν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τούτων φασκεῖν τὴν θεοσεβείαν μεμαθηκεῖν λέγει, γινώτω ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλοῖς γεγραμμένων, ὅτι οὐκ αὐτοῖς ἀλλὰ ἡμῖν ἡ ἐκ τούτων διαφέρει διδασκαλία· τὸ δὲ παρὰ Ἰουδαίῳ ἐτι καὶ νῦν τὰς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ θεοσεβείᾳ διαφερούσας σωζεσθαι βιβλοὺς, θείας προνοίας ἔργον ὕπερ ἡμῶν γεγενυέν· ἵνα γὰρ μὴ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προκομιζόντες, προφασιν ῥαδιουργίας τοῖς βουλομένοις βλασφημεῖν ἡμᾶς παρασχῶμεν, ἀπο τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῆς ταύτας ἀξιούμεν προκομιζεσθαι, ἵνα ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐτι παρ' αὐτοῖς σωζομένων βιβλίων, ὥς ἡμῖν τὰ πρὸς διδασκαλίαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀνδρῶν γραφέντα δίκαια σαφῶς καὶ φανερώς προσ-
ηκεῖ, φανῇ. Id. ib. § 13. p. 17. (Ed. Col. p. 14.)

² See Apol. 1. §§ 14—17. pp. 51—54. (Ed. Col. Apol. 2. pp. 61—64.)

³ See Apol. 1. § 12. p. 50. and §§ 30—33. pp. 61—64. (Ed. Col. Apol. 2. p. 60 and pp. 72—74.)

⁴ Ὁ θεὸς λόγος . . . ὡ παθῶν δεινῶν φυγαδευτήριον, ὡ πυρὸς ἐμψυχῶν σβεστικὸν διδασκαλίον, κ. τ. λ. In. Orat. ad Græc. § ult. pp. 4, 5.

⁵ Ἐλθετε, παιδευθητε· γενεσθε ὥς ἐγώ· ὅτι καγὼ ἡμῖν ὥς ὑμεῖς. Ταῦτα με εἰλε, το τε τῆς παιδείας ἐνθεόν, καὶ το τοῦ λόγου δυνατόν. Id. ib. p. 5.

From these statements, therefore, it is evident that the ground upon which Justin Martyr's faith rested, that the Bible was the Word of God, was the internal testimony it contains to its having emanated from a Divine source.

Nor let it be supposed that his mode of reasoning was suitable only to the Jews or heathen, whom he was addressing. For, as it respects this point, viz., the question whether the Bible is the Word of God, all men are similarly circumstanced. If there are any serious doubts on this point, such doubts cannot be removed by any human authority. He who has such doubts, is for the moment, as far as that point is concerned, precisely in the same situation with any other unbeliever. Human testimony may be available, as giving evidence more or less credible to facts connected with the authorship and preservation of the books of Scripture; but here, so far from depending upon the testimony of the Church alone, we have several other sources of information, and those less open to suspicion.

We have no reason to suppose, then, that Justin Martyr would have adopted any other mode of reasoning, had he been addressing the professing Christian Church on this subject; for the ground or evidence upon which the faith of men in Scripture, as the Word of God, rests, must be the same with all.

At any rate that which is a *sufficient* proof of the Scripture being the Word of God to the Jews and heathen, must be a *sufficient* proof to all others; so that we have no need to receive the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture upon the testimony of tradition.

THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH (fl. a. 168.)

I proceed to Theophilus of Antioch, who says to Autolycus, "Be not, therefore, incredulous, but believe. For I also did not believe that this should be; but now having considered these things, I believe; having fallen in with the sacred writings of the holy Prophets, who also foretold, by the divine Spirit, the things which have

happened in the manner in which they happened; and the things that are now taking place, as they are taking place; and the things that are to come, in what way they will be fulfilled. *Therefore, having received a proof from those things happening which were foretold, I am not incredulous, but, in obedience to God, believe.*"¹

TATIAN (fl. a. 172.)

Proceeding to Tatian, let us observe in the following passage the grounds upon which *his* faith in the Scriptures rested. Having become dissatisfied, he tells us, with the heathen mythology, "I sought to know in what way I could find the truth. And while I was considering the things worthy of attention, it happened that I read certain foreign writings, more antient than the writings of the Greeks as it regards the doctrine of the Greeks, and more divine as it regards their errors. And it turned out that I was brought to believe them, both on account of the simplicity of the style, and the freedom from artifice in the authors, and the plain account given of the creation of the universe, and their foreknowledge of things to come, and the magnitude of their promises, and the majesty of all which they have written. And my soul having thus become taught by God, I understood," &c.²

The faith of Tatian, therefore, was grounded upon the

¹ Μη ουν απιστει, αλλα πιστευε. Και γαρ εγω ηπιστουν τουτο εσεσθαι, αλλα νυν κατανοησας αυτα πιστευω, αμα και επιτυχων ιεrais γραφαις των αγιων προφητων, οι και προειπον δια πνευματος Θεου τα προγεγονοτα, ω τροπω γεγονε, και τα ενεστωτα τινι τροπω γινεται, και τα επερχομενα ποια ταξει απαρτισθησεται αποδειξιν ουν λαβων των γινομενων και προσαναπεφωνημενων, ουκ απιστω' αλλα πιστευω πειθαρχων Θεω. THEOPH. ANT. Ad Autol. lib. i. § ult. p. 346. (Ed. Col. p. 78.)

² Εξήτουν, ότω τροπω ταληθες εξευρειν δυναμαι. Περινοουντι δε μοι τα σπουδαια, συνεβη γραφαις τισιν εντυχειν βαρβαρικαις, πρεσβυτεραις μεν ως προς τα Έλληνων δογματα, θειοτεραις δε ως προς την εκεινων πλανην και μοι πεισθηναι ταυταις συνεβη δια τε των λεξεων το ατυφον και των ειποντων το ανεπιτηδευτον, και της του παντος ποιησεως το ευκαταληπτον, και των μελλοντων το προγνωστικον, και των παραγγελματων το εξαισιον, και των όλων το μοναρχικον. Θεοδιδακτου δε μου γενομενης της ψυχης, συνηκα, ότι, κ. τ. λ. TATIANI Contra Græc. orat. § 29. pp. 267, 8. Ed. Bened. (p. 165. ed. Colon. 1686.)

internal evidence which Scripture itself contains to its divine origin.

TERTULLIAN (fl. a. 192.)

To the same effect speaks Tertullian. "We prove," he says, "the Scriptures to be divine, if there is any doubt as to their antiquity." And how does he proceed to do this? From their own testimony. "Neither," he adds, "is this to be learnt with difficulty, or from any *external teacher*. The things that will teach us this truth are *before our eyes*. The world, the age, events. Whatever is done was foretold. Whatever is seen was there heard. That the earth swallows up cities, that the sea causes islands to disappear, &c. [adding various other events] all these are written beforehand. While we suffer these things, they are being read to us; while we recognize these events, their truth is proved. *The correctness of the prophecy is, I think, a sufficient proof of its divine origin*. Hence, therefore, our belief of things future is safe, as of things already proved, inasmuch as they were foretold with those things the truth of which is daily proved. The same words sound in our ears, the same writings make them known, the same Spirit moves in them How offend we, I pray you, when we believe also the future, who have already by two successive proofs learnt to believe them?"¹

¹ Divinas [i. e. "Scripturas"] probamus, si dubitatur antiquas. Nec hoc tardius aut aliunde discendum. Coram sunt quæ docebunt, mundus et seculum et exitus. Quicquid agitur, prænunciabatur. Quicquid videtur, audiebatur. Quod terræ vorant urbes, quod insulas maria fraudant, quod externa atque interna bella dilaniant, quod regnis regna compulsant, quod fames et lues et locales quæque clades et frequentia pleraque montium vastant, quod humiles sublimitate, sublimes humilitate mutantur, quod justitia rarescit et iniquitas increbescit, bonarum omnium disciplinarum cura torpescit, quod etiam officia temporum et elementorum munia exorbitant, quod et monstris et portentis naturalium forma turbatur, providenter scripta sunt. Dum patimur, leguntur; dum recognoscimus, probantur. Idoneum, opinor, testimonium divinitatis veritas divinationis. Hinc igitur apud nos futurorum quoque fides tuta est, jam scilicet probatorum; quia cum illis, quæ quotidie probantur, prædicebantur. Eadem voces sonant, eadem literæ notant, idem spiritus

Such, then, is the character of the arguments to which Tertullian would have recourse in proving the divine origin of the Scriptures.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (fl. a. 192.)

Our next witness shall be Clement of Alexandria, who not only does not offer anything to support the views of our opponents, though his subject would inevitably have led him to do so in several places, had he entertained them, but everywhere proposes, as the grounds of our faith in Scripture as the word of God, either the internal testimony afforded by the excellence of its doctrines and precepts, or the external testimony afforded by the fulfilment of prophecy, and the miracles of Christ and his followers, and the wonderful success of the Christian religion in the face of all opposition.

Thus, in his Admonition to the Gentiles, the whole of his argument is directed to the proof of the excellence of that religion laid down in the Scriptures, that the Holy Scriptures (according to a passage already quoted) are truly holy, for they make men holy, and even divine. We want, then, nothing more, if this argument is good; for that which proves the religion revealed in the Scriptures to be divine, proves all which we want a proof of. Are our opponents ready to give up this argument as not sufficiently forcible? If so, they are ready to yield the best bulwark of Christianity, and they will find that *ecclesiastical testimony* which they would substitute in its place but a broken reed. The testimony of the Church, indeed, is one which, if it be not obtruded upon men as having a degree of authority to which it has no claim, will always be received with respect, and be allowed its

pulsat. Unum tempus est divinationi, futura præfandi. Apud homines, si forte, distinguitur dum expungitur: dum ex futuro præsens, dehinc ex præsentis præteritum deputatur. Quid delinquimus, oro vos, futura quoque credentes, qui jam didicimus illis per duos gradus credere? TERTULL. Apologet. c. 20. ed. 1664. p. 18.

due weight in the decision of so important a question ; but it is a testimony which, from its very nature, can only occupy a secondary place.

So, also, in his *Stromata*, we find not the least reference to the testimony of the Church respecting the Scriptures, as proving their divine origin, but only appeals either to the internal testimony borne by their excellence to their own character, or to the external testimonies we have mentioned to the divinity of their doctrine. Thus he says,—“ Inquiry is an endeavour to ascertain something, by finding out, through certain signs, the subject of inquiry ; but discovery is the end and cessation of inquiry, when it has arrived at comprehension, which is knowledge And they say that a sign is that which goes before, or that which attends, or that which follows. Of the inquiry, therefore, respecting God, the discovery is, the doctrine delivered by the Son. But for a sign that that very Son of God is our Saviour, we have the prophecies that preceded his advent proclaiming him, and the testimonies concerning him that accompanied his birth among men, and also his mighty works preached and clearly manifested after his ascension. The evidence, therefore, that the truth is with us, is that the Son of God taught it. For if in every question these general principles are ascertained, the person and the thing, that which is really the truth is shown to be with us alone ; since of the truth so manifested the person manifesting is the Son of God, but the thing manifested is *the power of the faith*, which rises superior to every one, whosoever he may be, that opposes it, nay even the whole world itself arrayed against it.” ¹

¹ Ἔστιν δὲ ἡ μὲν ζητησις, ὁρμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ καταλαβεῖν, διὰ τινῶν σημείων ἀνευρισ-
κουσα τὸ ὑποκειμενον· ἡ εὕρεσις δὲ, περὶ αὐτῆς ἀναπαύσις· ζητήσεως ἐν καταληψί
γενομένης· ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ γνῶσις· σημείων δ' εἶναι φασὶ τὸ προηγουμενον, ἡ
συνυπαρχον, ἡ ἐπομενον· τῆς τοίνυν περὶ Θεοῦ ζητήσεως εὕρεσις μὲν, ἡ διὰ τοῦ
υἱοῦ διδασκαλία· σημείον δὲ τοῦ εἶναι τὸν Σωτῆρα ἡμῶν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
Θεοῦ, αἱ τε προηγουμενὰ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ προφητεῖαι, τούτων κηρύσσουσιν·
αἱ τε συνυπαρξασαὶ τῇ γενήσει αὐτοῦ τῇ αἰσθητῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίαι· πρὸς δὲ
καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀναλήψιν κηρύσσονται τε καὶ ἐμφανῶς δεῖκνυμεν αὐτοῦ

And alluding again further on to these testimonies, as the evidences that the Christian faith came from God, he adds,—“The word of our Master hath not remained in Judea only as philosophy in Greece, but has been diffused through the whole world . . . and as to the Grecian philosophy, if any magistrate opposed it, it immediately perished; but as to our doctrine, from the very period of its first promulgation it has been opposed by kings and emperors, and magistrates and generals, with all their mercenaries, and innumerable other men, who have made war against us, and done all they could to cut us off; but it *flourishes the more*; for it perishes not, like a human doctrine, it languishes not, like a powerless gift, for no gift of God is powerless, but remains unimpeded, though under the prediction that it shall be persecuted unto the end.”¹

These, and such only as these, are the considerations which are used by Clement as the grounds for faith in the revelations of Scripture as the word of God. He does not even allude to the testimony of the Church, but places the whole burthen of proof upon evidence altogether distinct from and independent of that testimony; for the miracles and wonderful propagation of Christianity to which he alludes may be abundantly proved from other sources.

τεκμηριον αρα του παρ' ἡμιν ειναι την αληθειαν, το αυτον διδασκει τον υιον του Θεου· ει γαρ περι παν ζητημα καθολικα ταυτα ευρισκεται, προσωπον τε και πραγμα, ἡ οντως αληθεια παρ' ἡμιν δεικνυται μονοις· επει προσωπων μεν της δεικνυμενης αληθειας, ὁ υιος του Θεου· το πραγμα δε, ἡ δυναμις της πιστewς, ἡ και παντος οϋτινος ουν εναντιουμενου, και αυτου ὅλου ενισταμενου του κοσμου πλεοναζουσα. CLEM. ALEX. Strom. lib. vi. p. 801 (or, 674.)

¹ Ὅ δε γε του διδασκαλου του ἡμετερου λογος, ουκ εμεινεν εν Ιουδαια μονη, καθαπερ εν τη Ἑλλαδι ἡ φιλοσοφια· εχυθη δε ανα πασαν την οικουμενην . . . και την μεν φιλοσοφίαν την Ελληνικην εαν ὁ τυχων αρχων κωλυση, οιχεται παραχρημα· την δε [δε] ἡμετεραν διδασκαλιαν εκ τοτε συν και τη πρωτη καταγγελια κωλυουσιν ὁμοι βασιλεις, και τυραννοι, και οἱ κατα μέρος αρχοντες, και ἡγεμονες μετα των μισθοφορων ἀπαντων, προς δε και των απειρων ανθρωπων, καταστρατευομενοι τε ἡμιν και ὁση δυναμις εκκοπτειν πειρωμενοι· ἡ δε, και μαλλον ανθει· ου γαρ ὡς ανθρωπινη αποθνησκει διδασκαλια, ουδ' ὡς ασθενης μαραινεται δωρεα. ουδεμια γαρ ασθενης δωρεα Θεου· μνει δε ακωλυτος, διωχθησεσθαι εις τελος προφητευθεισα. Id. Strom. lib. vi. p. 827. (or, 697, 8.)

ORIGEN (fl. a. 230.)

Let us proceed to Origen, who in the beginning of his fourth book "On first principles," expressly treats on the grounds we have for believing the Scriptures to be divine; and throughout the whole of his remarks never once alludes to the testimony of the Church, as forming even one of those grounds.

He first points out how different had been the reception given by the world to the two great lawgivers of the Jews and Christians, Moses and Jesus Christ, to that which heathen philosophers had experienced, none of the latter having induced even one whole nation to live according to their precepts.¹ He then proceeds to remark, that the success of Christianity in so short a time, and propagated by so few persons amidst the greatest opposition, was what he could not hesitate to call a work beyond the power of man.² And this was predicted by Christ; and thus the fulfilment of his predictions shows that God truly incarnate had delivered to men the doctrines of salvation.³ He then adverts to the prophecies of the Old Testament, and their fulfilment in Christ, as a further evidence.⁴ The next point he mentions is the journeying of the Apostles into the whole world, as a superhuman undertaking, the consequence of a divine command; and that the way in which their new doctrine was listened to, and those who plotted against them were overcome by a divine power watching over them, might well make us believe that they worked miracles, and that God bore them witness by signs and wonders;⁵ where

¹ ORIGEN. De princip. lib. iv. § 1. tom. i. pp. 156, 7. ed. Ben.

² Μείζον η κατα ανθρωπον το πραγμα ειναι λεγειν ου διαταζομεν. Id. Ib. § 2. i. 157.

³ 'Οτε δε εκβεβηκε τα μετα τσαντης εξουσιας ειρημενα. εμφανει θεον αληθως ενανθρωπησαντα σωτηρια δογματα τοις ανθρωποις παραδεδωκεναι. Id. Ib. i. 158.

⁴ Id. Ib. §§ 3—5. i. 158—161.

⁵ Επιστησάτω δε τις και τη των αποστολων πανταχосε επιδημια των υπο του Ιησου επι το καταγγειλαι το ευαγγελιον πεμφθεντων, και οφεται και το τολμημα

we may observe how he places our belief in the fact of their having worked miracles, not upon mere human testimony, but upon the deductions of sense and reason from what was obvious. To which we may add, he remarks, that the advent of Christ threw a light upon the prophecies, which proved them to be from God.¹ “Nay,” he says, “he who carefully and attentively reads the prophecies, feeling from the very perusal of them the footsteps of inspiration, will, by the effect produced upon him, be convinced that what are esteemed to be the words of God are not the writings of men.”² And, lastly, he points to the effects of Scripture teaching on the minds of men, notwithstanding its simplicity, as another evidence of its divine origin.³

And there he quits the subject, proceeding to say, that having thus briefly spoken to the question that the divine Scriptures are divinely inspired, it was necessary for him to pass on to the method of reading and understanding them.⁴

And in the same way he refers, in his controversy with Celsus, to the fulfilment of the prophecies, as the ground

ον κατα ανθρωπον, και το επιταγμα θειον. Και εαν εξετασωμεν πως ανθρωποι καιινων μαθηματων ακουοντες και ξενων λογων προσηκαντο τους ανδρας, νικηθεντες εν τω θελειν αυτοις επιβουλευειν υπο τινος θειας δυναμεως επισκοπουσης αυτους, ουκ απιστησομεν ει και τεραστια πεποιηκασιν, επιμαρτυρουντος του Θεου τοις λογοις αυτων, και δια σημειων, και τερατων, και ποικιλων δυναμεων. *Id. Ib. § 5. i. 161.*

¹ ‘Η Ιησου επιδημια εις τουμφανες ηγαγεν, ως ουρανιω χαριτι αναγεγραμμενα. *Id. Ib. § 6. i. 161, 2.*

² ‘Ο δε μετ’ επιμελειας και προσοχης εντυγχανων τοις προφητικοις λογοις, παθων εξ αυτου του αναγινωσκειν ιχνος ενθουσιασμου, δι’ ὃν πασχει, πεισθησεται, ουκ ανθρωπων ειναι συγγραμματα τους πεπιστευμενους Θεου λογους. *Id. Ib. § 6. i. 162.*

³ Ει γαρ αι καθημαξευμεναι των αποδειξεων ὁδοι παρα τοις ανθρωποις εναποκειμεναι τοις βιβλίοις κατισχυσαν των ανθρωπων, η πιστις ημων ευλογως αν υπελαμβανετο εν σοφια ανθρωπων, και ουκ εν δυναμει Θεου. Νυν δε τω επωραντι τους οφθαλμους, σαφες οτι ο λογος και το κηρυγμα παρα τοις πολλοις ου δεδυνηται εν πειθοις σοφιας λογοις, αλλ’ εν αποδειξει Πνευματος και δυναμεως. *Id. Ib. § 7. i. 163.*

⁴ Μετα το ως εν επιδρομη ειρηκεναι περι του θεοπνευστους ειναι τας θειας γραφας, αναγκαιον επεξελθειν τω τροπω της αναγνωσεως και νοησεως αυτων. *Id. Ib. § 8. i. 164.*

upon which they were considered to be divinely inspired ; and that, therefore, Christians did not believe without having a reasonable foundation for their belief, as Celsus had objected to them.¹

LACTANTIUS (fl. a. 303.)

“ Those who are ignorant of the truth,” says Lactantius, “ think that the prophets are not to be believed. For they say that their words are not divine, but human.” How, then, does he meet this, and in what way does he endeavour to lead these objectors to a recognition of the divine inspiration of Scripture? His words are these ;— “ But we daily see their prophecies fulfilled, and in the course of fulfilment ; and the agreement in their prophecies shows that they were not mad. . . . Were they, then, deceitful who uttered such things? What can be so completely alien to them as a design to deceive, when they restrain others from every kind of fraud? Moreover, the desire to fabricate and lie belongs to those who seek wealth, who desire gain ; which was far from being the case with those holy men. . . . Therefore, where the desire of gain was absent, there also the will and the reason for deception was absent.”²

Such are the grounds upon which Lactantius places the proof of the divine inspiration of Scripture.

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA (fl. a. 315.)

Let us proceed to Eusebius of Cæsarea, in whose works

¹ *Id.* *Contra Cels.* lib. vi. § 10. i. 636, 7.

² *At enim veritatis expertes non putant his [i. e. prophetis] esse credendum. Illas enim non divinas sed humanas voces fuisse aiunt. . . . Atqui [at quin *P. ed.*] impleta esse in plerisque [implerique *Par. ed.*] quotidie illorum vaticinia videmus ; et in unam sententiam congruens divinatio docet non fuisse furiosos. . . . Num ergo fallaces erant, qui talia loquebantur ? quid ab his tam longe alienum quam ratio fallendi, cum cæteros ab omni fraude cohiberent ? Præterea voluntas fingendi ac mentiendi eorum est qui opes appetunt qui lucra desiderant ; quæ res procul ab illis sanctis viris abfuit. . . . Ergo a quibus abfuit studium lucri, abfuit etiam voluntas et causa fallendi, &c. LACTANT. *Instit.* Lib. I. c. 4. (Cant. 1685, p. 9. *Par.* 1748. vol. i. p. 13.)*

entitled, “The Evangelical Preparation,” and “The Evangelical Demonstration,” the reader will find this matter fully discussed, but to which our present limits will only admit of this general reference.

Moreover, as it respects the authority or grounds upon which we draw the line between the Apostolical books and those falsely pretending to an Apostolical origin, Eusebius refers us not exclusively to the testimony of ecclesiastical writers, but to the internal evidence. After having stated that they are not quoted by ecclesiastical writers, he adds, “Moreover, the phraseology differs from that used by the Apostles. And the sentiments, as well as the object of those things which are delivered in them, differing very widely from the true orthodox faith, clearly show that they are the productions of heretics.”¹

And further on, speaking of some books professing to contain the dialogues of Peter and Appion, he says, “Of which there is no mention made by the antients; for they do not preserve the pure mark of Apostolical orthodoxy.”²

HILARY OF POICTIERS (fl. a. 354.)

Hilary of Poitiers, giving an account of the way in which he himself had been induced to accept Scripture as a divine revelation, thus writes;—“Therefore, while I was turning over in my mind these things, and many others of the same kind, I fell in with those books which the religion of the Hebrews declared to be written by Moses and by the prophets, in which, God himself, the Creator, testifying of himself, these things were thus con-

¹ Πορρω δε που και ο της φρασεως παρα το ηθος το αποστολικον εναλλαττει χαρακτηρ' η τε γνωμη και η των εν αυτοις φερομενων προαιρεσις, πλειστον υσον της αληθους ορθοδοξιας απαδουσα, οτι δη αιρετικων ανδρων αναπλασματα τυγχανει, σαφως παριστησιν. EUSEB. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 25. (Ed. Read. vol. i. p. 120.)

² 'Ον ουδ' ολως μνημη τις παρα τοις παλαιοις φερεται ουδε γαρ καθαρον της αποστολικης ορθοδοξιας αποσωζει τον χαρακτηρα. Ib. c. 38. (Ed. ead. vol. i. p. 135.)

tained, 'I am that I am;' and again, 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, He that is, sent me unto you.' I was at once struck with admiration at so perfect a description of God, which declared the incomprehensible knowledge of the divine nature in words most suitable to the human understanding. . . . My mind, held by the desire of the truth, was delighted with these most pious notions respecting God. . . . Therefore, my mind, full of these researches after the views and doctrines of piety, rested as it were in a place of retirement, viewing afar off this most beautiful theory. . . . But my mind was agitated, partly by its own fear, partly by that of the body. Which, when it firmly retained its views in a pious confession respecting God, and had become anxious and careful respecting itself and this its abode, about, as it supposed, to fall with itself, after becoming acquainted with the law and the prophets, it arrives at the knowledge also of that Evangelical and Apostolical doctrine, 'In the beginning was the Word, &c.' . . . [and quoting other passages of Scripture, he adds] . . . Here, now, my fearful and anxious mind found more hope than it expected. . . . Therefore my mind embraced joyfully this doctrine of the divine mystery. . . . In this ease and consciousness of its security my mind, full of joyful hopes, had found rest," &c.¹

¹ Hæc igitur, multaque alia ejusmodi cum animo reputans incidi in eos libros quos a Mose atque a prophetis scriptos esse Hebræorum religio tradebat; in quibus ipso creatore Deo testante de se hæc ita continebantur, 'Ego sum qui sum;' et rursum, 'Hæc dices filiis Israel, misit me ad vos Is qui est.' Admiratus sum plane tam absolutam de Deo significationem, quæ naturæ divinæ incomprehensibilem cognitionem aptissimo ad intelligentiam humanam sermone loqueretur. . . . His religiosissimis de Deo opinionibus veri studio detentus animus delectabatur. . . . His itaque piæ opinionis atque doctrinæ studiis animus imbutus, in secessu quodam ac specula pulcherrinæ hujus sententiæ requiescebat. . . . Fatigabatur autem animus partim suo partim corporis metu. Qui cum et constantem sententiam suam pia de Deo professione retineret et sollicitam de se atque hoc occasuro secum, ut putabat, habitaculo suo curam recepisset, post cognitionem legis ac prophetarum istiusmodi quoque doctrinæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ instituta cognoscit; 'In principio erat Verbum, &c.' . . . Hic jam mens trepida et anxia plus spæi invenit quam exspectabat. . . . Hanc itaque divini sacramenti doctrinam

To nothing, we see, does Hilary refer as having induced him to accept the doctrine of Scripture as divine, but the power of the internal evidence.

AUGUSTINE (fl. a. 396.)

Our next witness is Augustine, who in his "Confessions" thus states the motives that in his own case led to a recognition of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures.

"Thou, O Lord," he says, "with thy most mild and merciful hand, by degrees settling and composing my mind, when I considered how many things I believed which I did not see, and was not present when they were done didst persuade me that not those who believed thy books, which thou hast supported by such a weight of authority in almost all nations, were to be blamed, but those who did not believe them; *and that those were not to be listened to who might say to me, Whence do you know that those books were supplied to mankind by the Spirit of the true and most faithful God?* Since we [mortals] were weak for the discovery of the truth by evident reason, and on this account there was need of the authority of the holy Scriptures, I had already begun to be convinced, that thou wouldst not at all have given so preeminent an authority to that Scripture through all lands, unless it had been thy will that through it thou shouldst be believed in, and through it thou shouldst be sought. For now, having heard many things in them shown to have the appearance of truth, I referred the [seeming] absurdity which used to offend me in those writings to the sublimity of the mysteries [of which they spoke]; and that authority appeared to me to be more venerable, and worthy of a more devoted faith, on account of its being open to the perusal of all, and pre-

mens læta suscepit. . . . In hoc ergo conscio securitatis suæ otio mens spebus suis læta requieverat," &c. HIL. PICT. De Trin. lib. 1. §§ 5—14. col. 768—74.

serving the dignity of its mystery in a more profound meaning, while, by its plain words and simple style of phraseology, it offers itself to all, and exercises the diligence of those who are not light minded." ¹

And a little further on in the same work he says,—“ I will hear and understand how in the beginning thou didst make the heaven and the earth. Moses wrote this; he wrote it and departed,” and adding, that had he been present he would have asked him of the matter, he says, “ But whence should I know whether he spoke the truth? And if I knew this, should I know it from him? Truth within me . . . would say, He speaks the truth; and I, immediately assured, would say confidently to thy messenger, Thou speakest the truth.” ²

Such were the actings of Augustine's own mind on this point, and I need hardly add that the testimony borne in a work of this kind is much more forcible as an index of the real views of Augustine than any statements in his controversial works.

¹ Tu, Domine, manu mitissima et misericordissima pertractans et componens cor meum, consideranti quam innumerabilia crederem quæ non viderem, neque cum gererentur adfuissem . . . persuasisti mihi non qui crederent libris tuis, quos tanta in omnibus fere gentibus auctoritate fundasti, sed qui non crederent esse culpandos, nec audiendos esse, si qui forte mihi dicerent, Unde scis illos libros unius veri et veracissimi Dei Spiritu esse humano generi ministratos? . . . Cum essemus infirmi ad inveniendam liquida ratione veritatem, et ob hoc nobis opus esset auctoritate sanctarum litterarum, jam credere cœperam nullo modo te fuisse tributurum tam excellentem illi Scripturæ per omnes jam terras auctoritatem, nisi et per ipsam tibi credi et per ipsam te quæri voluisses. Jam enim absurditatem quæ me in illis litteris solebat offendere, cum multa ex eis probabiliter exposita audissem, ad sacramentorum altitudinem referebam: eoque mihi illa venerabilior et sacrosancta fide dignior apparebat auctoritas, quo et omnibus ad legendum esset in promptu, et secreti sui dignitatem in intellectu profundiore servaret, verbis apertissimis et humillimo genere loquendi se cunctis præbens et exercens intentionem eorum qui non sunt leves corde. AUGUSTINI Confess. lib. vi. c. 5. tom. i. col. 122, 123. ed. Ben.

² Audiam et intelligam quomodo in principio fecisti cælum et terram. Scripsit hoc Moyses, scripsit et abiit. . . . Sed unde scirem an verum diceret? Quod si et hoc scirem, num ab illo scirem? Intus utique mihi, intus in domicilio cogitationis. . . . Veritas, sine oris et linguæ organis, sine strepitu syllabarum diceret, Verum dicit. Et ego statim certus confidenter illi homini tuo dicerem, Verum dicis. Id. Ib. lib. xi. c. 3. i. 197.

Moreover, as to the grounds upon which we rest the genuineness and incorrupt preservation of the books of Scripture, the following passage from his work against Faustus the Manichee, will clearly show us what was his view of the matter. "If you ask of us," he says, "how we know that these are the writings of the Apostles, we briefly answer you, that we know this just in the same way as you know that these are the writings of Manichæus;"¹ proceeding to say that as they would laugh at any one who should deny "a thing confirmed by such a continued line of connexion and succession,"² as that their books were written by Manichæus; so they themselves were to be laughed at if they questioned the genuineness of the canonical Apostolical writings, "an authority having such a foundation to rest upon, preserved and carried down by certain successions from the times of the Apostles, even to the present time."³

And he says elsewhere (in a passage already quoted),—"The integrity and a knowledge of the writings of any one bishop, however illustrious, could not be so preserved, as the canonical Scripture is preserved by *the variety of the languages in which it is found, and by the order and succession of its rehearsal in the Church*; against which nevertheless there have not been wanting those who have forged many things under the names of the Apostles. To no purpose indeed, *because it was so in esteem, so constantly read, so well known.*"⁴

From these passages, then, it is evident that Augustine rested the question of the *genuineness* of the Scriptures not upon any *dictum* of the Church conveyed down by succession from Apostolical teaching, nor upon the *mere* testimony of the Church, but upon grounds similar to that

¹ Hic jam si quærat a nobis, nos unde sciamus Apostolorum esse istas litteras, breviter vobis respondemus, inde nos scire, unde et vos scitis illas litteras esse Manichæi. *Id.* Contra Faust. lib. xxxii. c. 21.

² Rem tanta connexionis et successionis serie confirmatam. *Id.* *Ib.*

³ Tam fundatæ auctoritati, a temporibus Apostolorum usque ad hæc tempora certis successionibus custoditæ atque perductæ. *Id.* *Ib.*

⁴ Ep. ad. Vincent. Rogat. ep. 93. ii. 246, 7. See vol. i. pp. 200, 201.

on which the genuineness of other books rests, though justly considering that those grounds were vastly more full and forcible in the former than in the latter case.

Nay, he draws a distinction between the canonical books themselves on account of the difference in the amount of the external testimony to them. "In the canonical Scriptures," he says, "let him follow the authority of as many Catholic Churches as possible, among which let those without fail be included which have deserved to have Apostolical Chairs and to receive Apostolical Epistles. Therefore he will observe this method in the canonical Scriptures, that he must prefer those which are received by all Catholic Churches to those which some do not receive; but in the case of those which are not received by all, let him prefer those which the greater number and the worthier receive, to those which the fewer Churches and those of less authority hold. But if he shall have found that some are maintained by the greater number, and others by those of more weight, although he cannot easily find this, I think, nevertheless, that such are to be esteemed of equal authority."¹

On the statements in this passage I offer no opinion, as that would be irrelevant to our present subject, but one thing it certainly proves, namely, the wide difference between the views of Augustine on the question, and those of the Romanists and the Tractators.

We may also remark, both from this and other passages, that Augustine often uses the word "authority," not in the sense of something absolutely and of itself binding those on whom it acts, but rather in the sense of

¹ In canonicis autem Scripturis Ecclesiarum Catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illæ sint, quæ Apostolicas Sedes habere et Epistolas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in Scripturis canonicis, ut eas quæ ab omnibus accipiuntur Ecclesiis catholicis, præponat eis quas quædam non accipiunt: in eis vero quæ non accipiuntur ab omnibus, præponat eas quas plures graviioresque accipiunt, eis quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis Ecclesiæ tenent. Si autem alias invenerit a pluribus, alias a gravioribus haberi, quamquam hoc facile invenire non possit, æqualis tamen auctoritatis eas habendas puto. *Id. De doctr. Christ. lib. ii. c. 8. iii. Part. 1. col. 23.*

a testimony, having a degree of weight proportioned to the character and power of him who bears it.

And this leads me to notice the famous passage so frequently objected to our views from Augustine. Writing against the Manichees, he says, "But I would not believe the Gospel, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not move me to do so."¹

But that "the authority of the Catholic Church" was not the *sole* motive that induced him to believe the Gospel, is evident from what we have already quoted above from his Confessions; nor does the passage imply as much, but only that "the authority of the Catholic Church" was one necessary ground upon which his belief rested; and that that "authority" was not absolute in his view, is evident, not only from other passages, but from the words that precede, where, after enumerating the motives which induced him to prefer the Catholic Church, and remarking that none of these were to be found with the Manichees, but only the promise of the truth, he adds,—“which indeed, if it is so manifestly exhibited as not to be doubtful, is to be preferred to all those things by which I am retained in the Catholic Church.”²

This passage, therefore, if explained so as to be consistent with Augustine's own statements elsewhere, means no more than that the witness of the Church to the Scriptures is an important and necessary *part* of the grounds upon which we believe the Scriptures. And if the construction of the argument seems to imply more, it is an inconsistency in which we must judge of Augustine's real sentiments by the general tenor of his statements, rather than by a casual argument in a controversial work, and an argument which, if I mistake not, savours more of the ingenuity of the sophist than the simplicity and force of truth.³

¹ Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas. Id. Contra Ep. Man. quam voc. Fundam. c. 5. viii. 154.

² Id. ib. c. 4. viii. 153. See the passage, p. 432 above.

See Laud's Conf. with Fisher, § 16. n. 20. p. 52. and § 19. n. 2. pp. 81, 2. d. 1686. and Stillingfleet's Vindication of the Answer to some late papers, pp. 47, 8. ed. 1687.

CHRYSTOM (fl. a. 398.)

Many other testimonies in favour of our views might be added from other writers, but, not to multiply them unnecessarily, we conclude with Chrysostom, who, in his first homily on Matthew, refers to the internal evidence of the Gospels, as showing the fidelity of the writers,¹ and also that they were assisted by the Spirit of God,² and to the influence and success of their *writings* in the world at large, as showing that a Divine power accompanied them.³

We have thus endeavoured to set before the reader the sentiments of the principal early Fathers on all the five points in which the views of our opponents, upon this question of the Divine Rule of faith and practice, may be summed up; and, without detaining him by any further observations on them, leave it to his judgment to determine whether their suffrages are with the Tractators, or with us.

We pass on to the consideration of the doctrine of the Church of England, and her principal divines, on this question; and hope, notwithstanding the representations of the Tractators, clearly to show that, with respect to these, there can be, if possible, even less doubt of their agreement with us, and repudiation of the doctrines we are here opposing, than in the case of those whose views we have been considering.

¹ CHRYS. In Matt. hom. 1. § 2. tom. vii. p. 5. C. p. 6. A, B.

² ID. Ib. § 3. vii. 8. A.

³ ID. Ib. § 4. vii. 8. C. 9. A, B.

CHAPTER XI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND HER
PRINCIPAL DIVINES, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

THE doctrine of the Tractators on the subject of "tradition," has been very confidently put forth by them as the doctrine of the Church of England; and an attempt has been made by Mr. Keble in particular to prove this to be the case, by a series of extracts from the works of Anglican divines.

Now, it cannot fail to strike the reader as very remarkable that, if the doctrine of the Church of England on this subject is, as we are now told, the same as that of the Church of Rome, our divines should have troubled themselves to write, as undeniably they have written, against the Romish *doctrine* of tradition and the Rule of Faith. If the question between us and Rome on this subject had been (as Dr. Pusey tells us) "purely historical,"¹ relating to the genuineness of certain particular traditions, to this question would the dissertations and remarks of our divines have been limited. There is, therefore, a *primâ facie* case against such a notion of the strongest kind. And I will venture to add, and will now endeavour to prove, that the further the inquiry be extended, the more complete and overwhelming will be the evidence against their having entertained such views.

¹ See vol. i. p. 38.

The extracts given by Mr. Keble in support of the system under consideration, are to be found in No. 78 of the Tracts for the Times, entitled, "Testimony of writers in the later English Church, to the duty of maintaining, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*,"—a copy of which is subjoined to his Sermon on Tradition, and the following remarks made respecting it; "He [i. e. Mr. Keble] is principally anxious to remove any impression which may exist of his wishing to recommend a new theory, or rule of faith, devised for present occasions, by any particular school of divines, now or at any former time. On the contrary, he is persuaded that what he is endeavouring to inculcate, is no other than the very rule of the Church of England, as distinguished on the one hand from Romish usurpation, on the other from rationalistic licentiousness. *And in support of this persuasion, he appeals to the collection of authorities concerning Tradition, from the standard English divines, under the title of Catena Patrum, which is subjoined to this reprint of the sermon, by permission of the editor of the Tracts for the Times. If he err in his estimate of the spirit of the English Church, it will appear, he trusts, by those papers, that at least his error was not of his own invention—that he has both high and ancient authority for it.*" (p. 68.)

And in the introductory observations in this Tract, we are told that the extracts were intended "*to show that the succession of our standard divines ever since their [the reformers'] times, understood them to hold that view of doctrine which it has been the endeavour of these Tracts [Tracts for the Times] to recommend; and that no other can be taken, without contradicting both that illustrious succession itself, and its judgment concerning the reformers.*"

These remarks, be it observed, are made of those very men, of whom Mr. Newman *now* tells us that, in the service of the Eucharist, they "mutilated the tradition of 1,500 years,"¹ that the Articles are "the offspring of an un-

¹ Letter to Faussett.

catholic age,"¹ that "it is NOTORIOUS that the Articles were drawn up by Protestants, and intended for the establishment of Protestantism,"² the word Protestantism being used to describe those views in our Church, which the Tractators *oppose*, their interpretation of the Articles being admitted to be "*Anti-Protestant*,"³ and "*not that which their authors took themselves*;"⁴ and of whom Mr. Keble himself tells us elsewhere that, in the revision of the liturgy, they gave up altogether the ecclesiastical tradition "regarding certain very material points in the celebration, if not in the doctrine, of the holy Eucharist;"⁵ and "*must have felt themselves precluded ever after from urging the necessity of episcopacy, or of anything else, on the ground of uniform Church-tradition.*"⁶

Such are the astounding self-contradictions of the Tractators.

"The doctrine maintained," says the Tract, is, that "Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it; Scripture is the document of faith, tradition the witness of it; THE TRUE CREED IS THE CATHOLIC INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE, or Scripturally-proved tradition; Scripture, by itself, teaches *mediately*, and proves decisively; tradition, by itself, proves negatively, and teaches positively; SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION, TAKEN TOGETHER, ARE THE JOINT RULE OF FAITH." (Tract 78. p. 2.)

These extracts, therefore, are put forth by Mr. Keble, and the Editor of the "Tracts for the Times," as proving that the divines, whom they have quoted, maintained their views of the doctrine of tradition.

The documents and authors quoted in this Tract, are as follow.

1. Jewell. 2. Convocation of 1571. 3. The Queen's Council of 1582. 4. Bilson. 5. Hooker. 6. Convocation of 1603. 7. Overall. 8. Morton. 9. Field. 10. White, (F.) 11. Hall. 12. Laud. 13. Montague. 14. Jackson. 15. Mede. 16. Usher. 17. Bramhall. 18. Sanderson. 19.

¹ Tract. 90. p. 4.

² Ib. p. 80.

³ Ib.

⁴ Ib. p. 81.

⁵ Pref. to Hooker, p. lxiii.

⁶ Ib.

Cosin. 20. Hammond. 21. Thorndike. 22. Taylor. 23. Heylin. 24. Commissioners of 1662. 25. Pearson. 26. Barrow. 27. Bull. 28. Stillingfleet. 29. Ken. 30. Beveridge. 31. Patrick. 32. Sharp. 33. Potter. 34. Grabe. 35. Brett. 36. Hicks. 37. Collier. 38. Leslie. 39. Waterland. 40. Bingham. 41. Jebb. 42. Van Mildert.

These form Mr. Keble's "illustrious cloud of witnesses for primitive tradition," as part of *the rule of faith* in the Church of England; and upon these authorities I, for my part, am quite willing to let the decision of the question rest. Mr. Keble shall have the full benefit of his own choice of authorities; and if he can prove that the witnesses whom he has cited support, as a body, his views of the subject, I will willingly allow that I have greatly misconceived the views of our Church upon this important question. I say not, indeed, that all the views of Archbishop Laud, and such as agreed with him, are to be held to be the views of the Church of England; still less that the statements of such divines as the nonjurors Brett and Hicks, *a small and extreme section of a small party in our Church*, (but who are now most extraordinarily put forward as the best witnesses of the doctrines of that Church,) are to be taken as our guide; but this I am quite willing to allow, that if the witnesses adduced by Mr. Keble on this subject could be shown generally, and *as a body*, to have supported his views, this would go far to prove that they were the views of the Church of England.

I will content myself, therefore, with Mr. Keble's own witnesses, but not with *his examination* of them. The principle upon which he proceeds seems to be, that every one who asserts that respect is due to antiquity, supports his system; and consequently he has obtained, *without the least difficulty*, a number of passages from various authors, all, as he tells us, defending his views. I will, therefore, venture to propose a little friendly cross-examination to these witnesses on the particular points which make up his system. In other words, in reply to extracts, containing, for the most part, merely general and indefinite tes-

timonies of respect to the writings of the primitive Church, (which all agree more or less to be due to them,) I will endeavour to set before the reader, clearly and fully, the real views of these authors upon the points in question.

To follow Mr. Keble through the whole list, is neither necessary nor practicable within any reasonable limits; unless, indeed, we could be satisfied with following the example of the "Catena" in giving a passage containing merely some general remarks, capable, when standing alone, of being understood in any way in which a partial reader might choose to interpret them. Our purpose, however, is altogether different. It is to give a full and correct representation of the views of those to whom we appeal, by passages directly bearing upon the particular points in question, and by a full exhibition of their statements upon those points. It is obvious that to do this with all to whom Mr. Keble has referred, would require a volume of itself; and that if a fair selection be made from the witnesses adduced, and their views be fully inquired into, the result of such an examination will suffice to show the real state of the case.

Two thirds at least of the authorities quoted by Mr. Keble, attribute no more value to the testimony of patristical tradition, than what we have freely granted to it; and of the rest hardly any, perhaps none, go further than to use those words of respect towards it, which may or may not imply that they held that testimony to have authority in the strict sense of the word; and which, in the case of many of them, certainly were *not* intended to imply it; because the writers have elsewhere disclaimed such a notion.

It is not, however, a point which we need feel at all solicitous to prove, that *no one*, in our communion, has ever broached similar sentiments to those maintained in the system under review, (though I should find it difficult to mention *one* who ever adopted the system of the Tractators *as a whole*;) and therefore, without being anxious to deny that some few of those mentioned in the Ca-

tena, such as Brett, Hicks, &c. may have maintained the views we are here opposing, I am satisfied with showing that it is one altogether opposed to the views advocated in the authorized documents of the Church of England, and by the great body of her Divines.¹

Of the Extracts in the Catena, the 2nd and 6th are taken from the public documents of the Church of England; and the 3rd and 24th from documents with which her name is connected. I will first, then, investigate the testimony borne by *the Church of England* herself on such points, in her public and authorized documents, noticing in that inquiry the four extracts given by Mr. Keble, to which we have just alluded; and will then proceed to call in the following twelve from among Mr. Keble's witnesses; and I think the selection will be allowed to be fairly made, and to include the *élite* of his Catena.

1. Jewell. 2. Hooker. 3. Morton. 4. Hall. 5. Laud. 6. Jackson. 7. Usher. 8. Taylor. 9. Stillingfleet. 10. Patrick. 11. Waterland. 12. Van Mildert.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

(*Speaking in her authorized documents.*)

This is, of course, beyond all comparison the most important witness; and from all the various documents of authority setting forth, directly or indirectly, the doctrine of our Church, Mr. Keble can find nothing to quote in support of his views, but a canon passed in the Convocation of 1571, and one passed in that of 1603.

The canons of 1571 having never received the royal confirmation, were never put in force, and are of no authority;² but are, no doubt, valuable witnesses of the sen-

¹ For the statement of the points in dispute, see pp. 260, 261, above.

² "These Canons, though subscribed by the Bishops of both provinces, wanted the Queen's ratification. The Queen was acquainted with what passed in the Synod, and approved the proceedings; but, as it happened, the royal assent was not given in form. Archbishop Grindal, therefore, demurred to the execution of these Canons; he was afraid a *Præmunire* might reach him. And it seems his scruples were not without reason; for, by venturing thus far, he would have been liable to prosecution, and must have cast himself upon the

timents of the English Church at that time. The canon in question relates to preachers, and orders that "they shall, in the first place, be careful never to teach anything from the pulpit to be *religiously held and believed* by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and antient bishops, [and there Mr. Keble stops, but the Canon goes on,] and since those articles of the Christian religion, which have been agreed upon by the Bishops in a lawful and holy synod . . . are beyond doubt collected out of the sacred books of the Old and New Testament, and agree in all things with the heavenly doctrine contained in them; and since the book of public prayers, and the book of the consecration of Archbishops, Priests, and Deacons, contain nothing opposed to that doctrine, whoever are sent to teach the people, shall confirm the authority and truth of those articles, not only by their sermons, but also by subscription They shall not teach *vain and senseless opinions, and heresies, and Popish errors* opposed to the doctrine and faith of Christ, nor anything at all by which the ignorant multitude may be roused to discord, or the love of novelty," &c.

The simple object of this canon, then, was to restrict preachers from bringing any doctrine before their hearers to be religiously held and believed, for which they had not *some* authority in the Catholic Fathers and antient bishops, and that in order to prevent their teaching "*vain and senseless opinions, and heresies, and POPISH ERRORS.*" That is, at a time when a great change had just been effected in the doctrine professed in the Church,—and a

Queen's mercy." Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 531. Nay more, had they received such confirmation, they would not be of any authority *now*,—for "Queen Elizabeth's confirmations [of the Canons passed in her reign] extended no farther than her own life." Archbishop Wake's State of the Church, &c. p. 507. And, on this ground, they are expressly excluded from "*the Canons*" of our Church, that is, *the Canons that are of authority*, by Bishop Gibson, who limits "*the Canons*" to those of 1603. See his Codex, Pref. pp. x, xi. In the Canons of 1603, many of the preceding were republished, and put in force; but *the Canon in question was not of the number.*

change from a form of religion, in which new articles of faith utterly unknown (as far as we can find) to the primitive Church had been introduced,—there was a prudent restriction placed upon preachers, to prevent their teaching “vain and senseless opinions, and heresies, and Popish errors,” as important truths, viz., that they should be able to support the doctrine they preached, by the authority of some generally-received writer or writers of antiquity. A rule “which [as Bishop Patrick says] was set us on purpose to preserve our preachers from broaching any idle, novel, or Popish doctrines, as appears by the conclusion of that injunction.”¹ “The Canon,” says Dr. Waterland, “does not order that they shall teach whatever had been taught by Fathers; no, that would have been setting up a new rule of faith; neither does it say that they shall teach whatsoever the Fathers had collected from Scripture; no, that would have been making them *infallible interpreters* or infallible reasoners: the doctrine *must be found first in Scripture*; only to be the *more secure* that we have found it there, the Fathers are to be called in to be, as it were, constant checks upon the presumption or wantonness of private interpretation. But then, again, as to private interpretation, there is liberty enough allowed to it. Preachers are not forbidden to interpret this or that text, or hundreds of texts, differently from what the Fathers have done; provided still they keep within the analogy of faith, and presume not to raise any new doctrine; neither are they altogether restrained from teaching anything new, provided it be offered as opinion only, or an inferior truth, and not pressed as *necessary* upon the people. For it was thought that there could be no *necessary* article of faith or doctrine now drawn from Scripture, but what *the antients* had drawn out before from the same Scripture: to say otherwise, would imply that *the antients* had failed *universally* in *necessaries*, which is morally absurd.”² A very prudent restriction at that time, and

¹ Treatise on Tradition.

² Imp. of Doctr. of Trin. ch. vii. On use and value of Eccles. Antiq. Works, vol. v. pp. 317, 18.

perfectly admissible at any time, but in support of the views of our opponents, it proves nothing ; but, in fact, as I shall show presently, is directly opposed to them. For the question between us is,—not whether the writings of the Catholic Fathers that remain to us, are a useful guide, and upon the whole ranged on the side of the orthodox faith ; so that he who goes contrary to them all in vital points, is in error ; but—whether their consent is authoritative, is part of the rule of faith, is binding upon the conscience ; and, I might add, whether, if it were so, with the exception, possibly, of a very few points laid down in so many words in Scripture, we could obtain their consentient testimony in favour of any one contested point of doctrine.

Now to the notion that their consent would be *authoritative in itself*, our Church, neither here nor elsewhere, holds out the smallest sanction. The direction was, indeed, a mere practical *recognition* of the *fact*, that the orthodox faith, in all vital points, was to be found in the writings of the Catholic Fathers, and a proposal of them to the clergy, as a useful practical check upon error. So that preachers in the Church of England might not bring forward, as a vital doctrine, a notion of their own, for which they could find no support in those writings ; a very prudent direction in a time of great ecclesiastical ignorance, and an especial safeguard against “Popish errors”—such, for instance, as that patristical tradition is a divine informant.

Nay, that it was not a *recognition* of the *impossibility* of their erring, as a body, is evident from the fact, that even *the creeds* are received by our Church on the sole ground of their being provable by Scripture, as we shall observe presently. She does not take even the creeds on their authority, but because she believes them to be agreeable to Scripture ; their suffrage, no doubt, being a strong additional motive for supposing such to be the sense of Scripture. And I add this, because it might be said, If it is impossible that all the Catholic Fathers

should have erred, and consequently that what is opposed to or unsupported by their writings in a vital point, must *necessarily* be erroneous; then it follows, that what is supported by all of them in such a point, must be infallibly true. Now, however probable this may be, it is no part of the foundation upon which our Church has built her faith. Her creed stands on better grounds.

True it is, that even if this position was granted, our opponents would gain nothing practically by it; because such a *consent* of even the Fathers whose writings *happen* to remain to us, cannot be proved, so as to enable us to turn it to any useful purpose. But even this is not *maintained* by our Church; nor is it a point which she is at all concerned to decide. She does not put forward the Catholic Fathers as *necessarily* inerrable as a body; but *believing* them to have been generally orthodox, (taking the Scriptures as her standard of judgment,) she, in the canon under consideration, proposed them to her clergy as such, and directed their writings to be used as a check upon error. And the positive use of their writings was maintained to this extent, viz. that some support must be found in them for every position affecting a vital point.

That this was her meaning, appears also from her having, in the subsequent part of the canon, put her own articles on the same footing. For it will not be contended that she put forth these as part of the rule of faith. No; in both cases she merely bears witness to what she believes to be the orthodox doctrine, and gives directions to her clergy likely to keep them within the limits of that doctrine.

Nay, further, this very canon is, as far as its authority goes, utterly subversive of the views of Dr. Pusey and his party. For their doctrine is, that our authoritative guide for the interpretation of Scripture, and some important points of doctrine, is *the tradition of the ORAL teaching of the Apostles*, preserved to us in the writings of the Fathers, whereas this canon ordains that nothing is to be advanced to be religiously believed "but what is

agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and COLLECTED *out of* THAT *very* doctrine by the Catholic Fathers;" clearly showing that our Reformers held that the Fathers *collected* their doctrine out of Scripture, and not (as our opponents affirm) from the successional delivery of the *oral* teaching of the Apostles. And all is forbidden by this canon, but what is agreeable to Scripture, and COLLECTED by the Fathers OUT OF SCRIPTURE. Very good advice for Dr. Pusey and his party at least, and I hope they will obey the injunction; and thus save us the infliction (as this canon was intended to do) of divers vain opinions and Popish errors.

And we may observe, by the way, how completely this canon overthrows the statement of Dr. Pusey in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, (p. 28,) that "it is *probable* that our Church means that things may be *required* to be believed, (provided it be not upon peril of salvation,) which are not proved by Holy Scripture; but *certain*, that, according to her, things not in Holy Scripture, may be subjects of belief;" and yet with strange inconsistency this very canon is urged upon us three pages after for our observance.

Moreover, it is to be remarked that in the authorized Canons of 1597 and 1603, there is no direction of the kind, nor any recognition of the rule we have been considering in the royal Injunctions or Episcopal Visitation inquiries of the time, but on the contrary, (as we shall see presently,) only whether "any have wilfully maintained and defended any heresies, errors, or false opinions, contrary to the faith of Christ and holy Scripture."¹

And where a rule on the same subject is given in the Canons of 1603, respecting strangers preaching in cathedrals, it is given thus;—"If any in his sermon shall publish any doctrine, either strange or disagreeing from the word of God, or from any of the Articles of Religion agreed

¹ Vis. Art. 1. Eliz. Wilk. iv. 190.

upon in the Convocation-house, a. 1562, or from the Book of Common Prayer, the Dean or the residents shall . . . give notice of the same to the Bishop," &c. (Canon 51.)

As to the Canon of 1603, quoted in the "Catena," it is difficult to conceive what support Mr. Keble can suppose his cause to receive from it. The object of the Canon is to *explain* the *lawful* use of the cross in baptism. And the explanation given is this, that notwithstanding the sign of the cross had been abused by the Romanists, yet that "the Church of England hath retained still the sign of it in baptism, following therein the primitive and apostolical Churches, and accounting it a *LAWFUL outward ceremony* and honourable badge, whereby the infant is dedicated to the service of him that died upon the cross." Therefore the Church of England (that I may not omit to refer to passages which Mr. K. might think favourable to him) following "the rules of the Scriptures and the practice of the primitive Church," and "with reverence retaining those ceremonies, which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men," retains the use of the sign of the cross in baptism as a *lawful* ceremony. Well, what then? Has this the slightest tendency to support the system in aid of which it is quoted? On the contrary, is it not merely throwing dust in the eyes of the inexperienced reader to quote such a passage in support of it? Our Church follows the example of the primitive Church in retaining the sign of the cross in baptism, as she does in many similar matters (see Canons 31, 32, 33, 60, 74); but so far from regarding that example as authoritative, she distinctly declares in her 34th Article, that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one or utterly like, for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word," and "every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies

or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."¹

There are two other testimonies, however, quoted by Mr. Keble, which it may be as well to notice here, though they are not, strictly speaking, testimonies of the Church, namely, the extract from the rules given to the Bishops by the Queen's Council in 1582, for conducting the controversy with the Papists, and that from the report of the Commissioners of 1662.

In the former it is directed that "if the Papists shall show any ground of Scripture and *wrest it to their sense*, let it be showed by the interpretation of the old doctors such as were before Gregory I. But if they can show *no* doctor that agreed with them in their said opinion before that time, then to conclude that they have no succession in that doctrine from the time of the Apostles, and above four hundred years after, when doctrine and religion were most pure, for that they can show no predecessor whom they might succeed in the same."

This is one of the straws caught at by Mr. Keble to keep his cause above water, and is precisely the same negative position as that maintained in the Canon of 1571. Does he suppose that there is any Protestant who professes to hold an article of faith unknown to the whole Christian Church for the first six centuries? For in that case only the extract would be relevant. All that it proves is the belief of the Council that the Romish doctrines censured as unscriptural, were unknown to the whole Christian Church for the first six centuries, and that if this could be shown, it was sufficient proof that the censure was just. But though the absence of certain testimony in favour of a doctrine judged unscriptural may be held sufficient to condemn it, it is very far from following that such testimony when in its favour is an authoritative witness, obliging us to receive it as scriptural. The negative position maintained in the direction given in the extract would not, I suppose, be called in question *in the*

¹ See testimony of Jewell below, and Hooker, Eccl. Pol. iii. 10.

abstract by any one professing the Christian faith, except possibly by some unusually extravagant Romanists. We willingly grant, therefore, that a doctrine, respecting which the testimony of Scripture is even doubtful, which can find no support in the patristical writings of the first six centuries, (considering the wide range taken by those that remain to us,) has no claim upon us as vital, and is open to just suspicion, while at the same time we maintain that the support which any doctrine does appear to us to receive in those writings is not any part of the ground upon which our faith should rest in the reception of it. Our faith should rest solely and entirely upon the (as it appears to us) evident revelation of it in the Scriptures.

The other extract, which is from the reply of the Commissioners of 1662 to the Presbyterians (§ 16), is given as follows,—“Ancient Liturgies in the Church, St. Chrysostom’s, St. Basil’s, St. James’s, and others, and such things as are found in them all, consistent with catholic and primitive doctrine, may well be presumed to have been from the first, especially since we find no original of these Liturgies from General Councils.” This passage is not quite fairly quoted. It stands in the original thus ;—“*That there were ancient Liturgies in the Church is evident. St. Chrysostom’s, St. Basil’s and others, and the Greeks tell us of St. James’s, much elder than they ; and though we find not in all ages whole Liturgies, yet it is certain that there were such in the oldest times, by those parts which are extant, as Sursum Corda, &c., Gloria Patri, &c., Benedicite, Hymnus Cherubinus, &c., Vere dignum et justum, &c., Dominus vobiscum, Et cum Spiritu tuo, with divers others. Though those that are extant may be interpolated, yet such things as are found in them all consentient [in another edition consistent] to catholic and primitive doctrine, may well be presumed to have been from the first, especially since we find no original of these Liturgies from General Councils.*” The way in which this passage has been altered is not a little remarkable. The

original says nothing, it will be observed, in favour of the authority of our copies of the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom, &c. but rather the contrary, while the professed extract speaks of them as genuine. However, to let that pass, what can either prove as to our present subject? It is asserted that such liturgical forms as are found in *all* the antient liturgies *consentient to catholic and primitive doctrine* may well be presumed to have been from the first. Well; this is a very good argument in favour of liturgies, in support of which it was advanced, but does it prove anything in favour of the Tractators' system? Will Mr. K. reply, These prayers are authoritative proofs of doctrine, if they have "been from the first?" Nay, but the test here proposed of their having been from the first is their being "consentient to catholic and primitive doctrine." So that this passage will not help him to advance one step in gaining an authoritative tradition. And here we see how much the alteration of the passage favours Mr. Keble's views, for the admission in the original, that these liturgies may be interpolated, renders it necessary to adopt this test, which according to Mr. Keble's version of the passage would not be necessary. I do not charge him with the alteration. Far from it. I believe him incapable of so acting. But I suppose he found the passage quoted somewhere as he has given it, and did not verify it.

Having considered the extracts brought forward by Mr. Keble in support of his system, I now proceed to point out those passages from which the views of our Church respecting it may, I hope, be without difficulty gathered.

The dogmatical works of authority in our Church are, first, those which have received the highest degree of authority, namely, the Articles,¹ Homilies, and Catechism, and, secondly, those which have received the ecclesiastical

¹ Among the "Requests and Petitions of the lower House of Convocation for discipline," in the Convocation of 1562, at which our present Articles were

and royal sanction, but not that of the whole Legislature, namely, Jewell's Apology and Nowell's Catechism.¹ The

settled, the second is,—“That certain Articles, *containing the principal grounds of the Christian religion*, be set forth, as well to determine the truth of things this day in controversy, as also to show what errors are chiefly to be eschewed.” (Wilk. Conc. iv. 240.) These Articles, therefore, being published in compliance with this request, may reasonably be considered as intended to take a wider scope than some would have us suppose; and this indeed we might infer from their title, “Articles . . . for the avoiding of diversities of opinions and for the establishing of consent touching true religion.”

¹ Of these two works Bishop Randolph says, in the preface to his *Enchiridion*,—“My choice has been principally directed to such works as had the sanction of public authority, and which may, therefore, be relied on as containing the final and decided opinions of our Reformers, approved of in the general by the Church at large. . . . Of this kind, that is, thus publicly received, were Jewell's Apology and Nowell's Catechism, the former of which is said to have been published with the consent of the bishops, and was *always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church*, in whose name it is written, the latter had *the express sanction of Convocation* . . . Both these works were publicly received and allowed.”

Of Jewell's Apology Collier tells us that it “was approved by the Queen, and set forth with the consent of the Bishops.” (vol. ii. p. 479.)

And the Bishop himself in his reply to Harding says, that he had the concurrence of the whole English clergy, and that the book had the Queen's license. It was first published in 1562, the very same year as our present Articles, and “by Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles, and four successive archbishops, the Apology was ordered to be read and chained up in all parish Churches throughout England and Wales.” (Watt sub *Jewell*.) And still further as conclusive for its reception, it is recognised in Canon 30 of the Canons of 1603, as “the Apology of the Church of England,” and is quoted by Hooker under the name of “The English Apology.” (E. C. ii. 6.)

Of Nowell's Catechism, Mr. Shepherd, in his *Elucidation of the Book of Common Prayer*, says,—“In 1562, the same year in which our present Articles of Religion were agreed upon, Nowell's Catechism was presented in MS. to the Convocation, who examined it with minute attention, and after making several alterations *unanimously sanctioned the performance by their synodal authority, and recommended it to public use*. Nowell, having received the book interlined and in some parts blotted, caused the whole to be transcribed, and sent the fair copy to Cecil, ‘not,’ he informs him, ‘in his own name, as afore, but in the name of the Clergy of the Convocation as *their book*, seeing it was by them approved and allowed.’ The MS. lay in Cecil's hands for above a year. It was then returned to Nowell with some learned notes upon it, and remained with him till 1570, when it was published and dedicated to the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London by name, and to all the bishops.” Collier, who gives a similar account (Hist. vol. 2. p. 491.), says that it was published at the request of the two archbishops. Among the “Requests and Petitions of the lower House of Convocation for discipline,” in 1562, the

testimonies given in the note below abundantly prove that these two latter works are of no inconsiderable authority as faithful representations of the doctrine of our Church. The indirect sources from which the doctrine of our Church is to be gathered are, first, our authorized liturgical forms and ecclesiastical laws,¹ and, secondly, in an *inferior* degree, the code of laws drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer

first was, "That a Catechism be set forth in Latin for the instructing of youth in the Universities and Grammar-schools throughout the realm;" (Wilk. Conc. iv. 240.) which was probably the reason for this Catechism being presented to them, though it appears to have been *written* before. Nowell was the Prolocutor of the Lower House at that Convocation.

¹ The ecclesiastical laws may conveniently be classed under two divisions, first, those which were made previous to the Reformation; and secondly, those which have been made since.

First, those which were made previous to the Reformation.

These consist partly of the Canons made in national and provincial Councils of our own Church, and partly of the laws adopted from the civil and common canon law, both of which were, to a considerable extent, received here in the Ecclesiastical Courts, though neither of them, as a whole, or as having any *authority* here of themselves, not even the canon law (except, I suppose, in matters of doctrine); and lastly of Acts of Parliament, and customs, or common law relating to ecclesiastical matters. (See Dr. R. Cosin's Prim. Lin. Polit. Eccl. Angl.; Gibson's Codex, (Introdn.) Blackstone and Burn.) Those adopted from the civil and common canon law, were either introduced by consent, and thus became, in time, by usage, the common law of the land, or by authority of Parliament. "All the strength," says Blackstone, "that either the Papal or Imperial laws have obtained in this realm—or, indeed, in any other kingdom in Europe—is only because they have been admitted and received by immemorial usage and custom in some particular cases, and some particular courts, and there they form a branch of the *leges non scriptæ*, or customary laws; or else because they are in some other cases introduced by consent of Parliament; and then they owe their validity to the *leges scriptæ*, or statute law. This is expressly declared in those remarkable words of the Statute 25 Hen. viii. c. 21, addressed to the King's royal Majesty, 'This your Grace's realm, recognising no superior under God, but only your Grace, hath been, and is, free from subjection to any man's laws, *but only to such* as have been devised, made, and obtained *within* this realm, for the wealth of the same; *or to such other*, as by sufferance of your Grace and your progenitors, the people of this your realm have taken at their free liberty, by their own consent, to be used among them; and have bound themselves, by long use and custom, to the observance of the same, not as to the observance of the laws of any foreign Prince, Potentate, or Prelate, but as to the *customed* and antient laws of this realm, originally established as laws of the same, by the said sufferance, consents, and custom; and none otherwise.' " (Blackst. i. 79, 80.)

and the principal divines in the time of Edward VI., the authority of which is, of course, very considerable,¹ Convocation canons, royal Injunctions and Episcopal Visitation articles.

As it respects the ecclesiastical canons made in this country, it is provided, in the Act entituled "The Submission of the Clergy, and Restraint of Appeals," (25 Hen. viii. c. 19.),—"That such canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial, being already made, which be not contrariant nor repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the King's prerogative royal, shall now still be used and executed, as they were afore the making of this Act, till such time as they be viewed, searched, or otherwise ordered and determined by the said two-and-thirty persons, or the more part of them, according to the tenor, form, and effect of this present Act." (Gibs. ii. 947.) And as the revision here contemplated never took effect, all such of these canons as are "not contrariant nor repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the King's prerogative royal," are still in force. On this enactment, Bishop Gibson observes, "The clause of the last-mentioned Act [quoted above] was a recognition of the authority of the *foreign* canon law in this nation, upon the foot of *usage* and *custom* [i. e. as far as it has been adopted]; to which this clause adds a Parliamentary authority or enactment to all *our own* canons and constitutions, which are not repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the King's prerogative royal." (Gibs. ii. 947.)

In matters of doctrine, the Canons in force here previous to the Reformation, may be said to be, for the most part, practically superseded, and many of them, of course, contradicted, by the Articles, homilies, and other recognized formularies of our Reformed Church. But in all cases they are of authority only when not disagreeing with them.

Secondly, those which have been made since the Reformation. These consist of Acts of Parliament and the Canons of 1603, which, however, not having been confirmed by Parliament, do not bind the laity. The Canons of 1640 are of no force; for, although they received the confirmation of the King, yet as Bishop Stillingfleet says, "After the King's restoration, an Act of Parliament passed (13 Car. ii. c. 12.) for restoring the bishop's ordinary jurisdiction, wherein a clause is added, *that this Act did not confirm those Canons of 1640*, but left the ecclesiastical laws as they stood 1639; which Act being passed by the King's assent, it voids the former confirmation of them, and so leaves them without force." (Still. Eccl. Cases, p. 258. ed. 1702.)

¹ This Code was first published in 1571, by John Fox, under the title, "Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum, ex autoritate primum regis Henrici viii. inchoata; Deinde per regem Edvardum vi. protracta adauctaque in hunc modum atque nunc ad pleniorum ipsarum reformationem in lucem edita." It was commenced in the reign of Henry VIII. (as this title witnesses), in the latter end of which an Act of Parliament was passed, empowering the king to appoint a commission of thirty-two persons to revise the ecclesiastical laws. And in the 3d and 4th Edw. VI. a similar Act was

By these documents let us test the views advanced by the Tractators on the subject now under consideration.

passed, and the commissioners appointed, consisting of eight bishops, eight divines, eight civilians, and eight common lawyers, having, of course, Archbishop Cranmer at their head, the names of whom may be seen in Collier, vol. ii. Records, No. 61. From these a sub-committee of eight, consisting of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Goodrick, Dr. Cox, Peter Martyr, &c. were appointed by the king to prepare the work. Whether the work as it now stands received the sanction of the body of the Commissioners, or even of those eight, is doubtful: Indeed, with the exception of Archbishop Cranmer, it is doubtful who were its authors. For in the "*Oratio D. Josiæ Simleri de vita et obitu P. Martyris*," it is said, "*Posteaquam a rege cura conscribendi leges ecclesiasticas primum xxxii. deinde xvi. [? viii.] viris commissa fuit, effecit Cant. Archiepiscopus ut P. Martyr in horum numero unus esset: ac tandem etiam cum munus hoc universum uni Cantuariensi a rege fuisset commissum, tribus tantum ad id desumptis sociis, Gualtero Haddono et Rolando Taylero J. C. tertium voluit esse Martyrem. Horum opera adjutus eas leges Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ præscripsit quæ magnam etiam nunc laudem habent apud omnes pios et doctos.*" (1583. 4to. p. 16.) And this account is somewhat confirmed by a note in Archbishop Cranmer's handwriting, in a copy of the work in MS. mentioned by Strype in his *Memorials of Cranmer*, at the chapter "*De Decimis*," as follows.—"This is fynished by us, but must be overseen again by Dr. Haddon." For Dr. Haddon was not one of the thirty-two commissioners. And so Strype says,—"The matter was in effect wholly intrusted by the king [i. e. Edw. VI.] to the Archbishop, [i. e. I suppose upon his finding the rest of the commissioners inactive in the matter,] who associated to himself, in the active part of this work, Taylor, Martyr, and Haddon;" the part of Haddon being to peruse what the others had drawn up, in order "if anything was less elegantly expressed to correct it," but "his corrections are very few, and but of words less proper, the work and words were mainly Cranmer's own." The MS. copy, mentioned above, was seen by Strype among Fox's MSS., and is "fairly written out by the Archbishop's secretary, with the title to each chapter prefixed, and the index of the chapters at the beginning, both of the Archbishop's own hand. In many places there be his own corrections and additions." (Strype's *Mem. of Cranmer*, lib. i. c. 30.) But however this may be, it is a work which has always been considered of great value, and is largely quoted by Bishop Gibson in his "*Codex Juris Eccl. Anglicani*," with the observation, "To facilitate the improvement of this constitution by suggesting such useful rules of order and discipline as have been established abroad or attempted at home . . . many of the passages out of the body of ecclesiastical laws, entitled *Reformatio legum*, &c. are grafted into this commentary, as candidates for a place in our constitution, in case the convocation shall think them deserving, or, at least, as not unworthy the consideration of that learned and venerable assembly." (Pref. p. xiii.) And Collier (who thinks it "most probable" that it "had passed the approbation" of all the commissioners, "considering it appears in so finished a condition,") says, "it appears to have been drawn up with no small share of judgment and learning." (*Hist.* vol. 2. p. 326.)

First as to patristical tradition being an unwritten word of God or divine informant in religion.

In the first place, we may fairly ask our opponents to point out some passage in our authorized ecclesiastical books, that gives some positive sanction to such a notion. So important a doctrine as this could not have been overlooked. Surely we should have been exhorted by our Church, had she entertained such a notion, to have availed ourselves of this "divine informant." We have a whole homily on the duty of reading the Scriptures. Where is the corresponding exhortation to avail ourselves of this other "word of God?" Nowhere. On the contrary, the only *word of God* recognized by our Church in *any* of her documents is the Scripture. Wherever the phrase occurs in *any* of her authorized documents, it is invariably identified with the Scriptures. And the only notices of "tradition" in our Articles and homilies are the following; viz. one in the 34th Article, entitled, "Of the traditions of the Church," where they are identified with the ceremonial rites of the Church, and it is said of them, "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly like;" and the other, in the first homily, where we are warned, "Let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the New and Old Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions, devised by men's imagination, for our justification and salvation. *For in holy Scripture is fully contained what we ought to do, and what to eschew, what to believe, what to love, and what to look for at God's hands at length.*"

Nay, more, we are expressly told in Dean Nowell's Catechism, that "*the Christian religion is to be learnt from no other source than from the heavenly word of God himself, which he hath delivered to us in the holy Scriptures;*" and in Jewell's Apology, that the Scriptures are "*the very sure and infallible rule whereby may be tried whether the Church do swerve or err, and whereunto all ecclesiastical doctrine ought to be called to account.*"

But to dwell upon this point is needless, for the testimonies relating to those that follow amply prove the views of our Church upon this.

Let us proceed to the second and third points, viz. that catholic consent is a part of the divine rule of faith and practice even in the fundamental articles, as the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, and as giving the full development of truths there but imperfectly developed, and as conveying to us various important points of divine origin not at all contained in Scripture.

First, as the interpreter of Scripture, and authoritative teacher of the fundamentals of religion.

Now our Church tells us, (Art. 6.) "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; *so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved THEREBY, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.*" But if catholic consent is the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, the doctrine so delivered to us as from Scripture is to be received as true on that *authority*. If, on the contrary, the reception of a doctrine is to depend (according to the Article) on the strength of the proof from Scripture, the *authority* of the traditional interpretation is yielded. The Article is but calculated to mislead, if a necessary part of the proof of the truth of a doctrine to us is, that catholic consent has so interpreted Scripture.

Our opponents endeavour to get over this difficulty, by saying that the Article relates only to teachers, not to the people at large. But what is gained for their cause by this? All that we contend for is, that full and sufficient proof exists in Scripture for the orthodox faith, and that men are to be called upon to believe it only as far as it is so proved. And if this is true as it respects the teacher, (which would follow from our opponents' own interpretation of the Article,) it is surely equally true as it respects the hearer. If the only fit ground of faith to the teacher is holy Scripture, then is that same Scripture

the only fit ground of faith to the people, unless the teacher is personally infallible, which I suppose even the Tractators will hardly venture to affirm.

Further ; what says the first homily, entitled, “ a fruitful exhortation to the reading and knowledge of holy Scripture ? ” “ Unto a Christian man there can be nothing either more necessary or profitable than the knowledge of holy Scripture, forasmuch as in it is contained God’s true word, setting forth his glory, and also man’s duty. And there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is or may be drawn out of that fountain and well of truth. Therefore, *as many as be desirous to enter into the right and perfect way unto God*, must apply their minds to know holy Scripture ; without the which they can neither sufficiently know God and his will, neither their office and duty. And as drink is pleasant to them that be dry, and meat to them that be hungry, so is the *reading, hearing, searching, and studying of holy Scripture*, to them that be desirous to know God or themselves, and to do his will.” “ Let us diligently *search* for the well of life in the books of the New and Old Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of men’s traditions, devised by men’s imagination, for our justification and salvation. *For in holy Scripture is FULLY contained what we ought to do, and what to eschew, what to BELIEVE, what to love, and what to look for at God’s hands at length.* ” “ These books, therefore, ought to be much in our hands, in our eyes, in our ears, in our mouths, but most of all in our hearts. For the Scripture of God is the heavenly meat of our souls, the hearing and keeping of it maketh us blessed, sanctifieth us, and maketh us holy ; it turneth our souls, it is a light lantern to our feet. It is a sure, stedfast, and everlasting *instrument of salvation* ; it *giveth wisdom* to the humble and lowly hearts. . . . The *words of holy Scripture* be called words of everlasting life, for they be God’s instrument ordained for the same

purpose. They have *power to turn*, through God's promise, and they be effectual through God's assistance." "That man is ashamed to be called a philosopher, which readeth not the books of philosophy; and to be called a lawyer, an astronomer, or a physician, that is ignorant in the works of law, astronomy, and physie. How can any man then say, that he professeth Christ and his religion, if he will not apply himself (as far forth as he can or may conveniently) to read and hear, and so to know *the books of Christ's Gospel and doctrine*." "Let us, therefore, apply ourselves, as far forth as we can have time and leisure, to know God's word, by diligent hearing and reading thereof, as many as profess God, and have faith and trust in him." "If you be afraid to fall into error by reading of holy Scripture, I shall show you how you may read *without danger of error*. Read it humbly, with a meek and a lowly heart, to the intent you may glorify God, and not yourself, with the knowledge of it; and read it not without daily praying to God that he would direct your reading to good effect, and take upon you to expound it no further than you can plainly understand it. For as St. Augustine saith, the knowledge of holy Scripture is a great, large, and a high place, but the door is very low, so that the high and arrogant man cannot run in, but he must stoop low, and humble himself, that shall enter into it. Presumption and arrogancy are the mother of all error, and humility needeth to fear no error. For humility will only search to know the truth; it will search and will bring together one place with another, and where it cannot find out the meaning, it will pray, it will ask of others that know, and will not presumptuously and rashly define anything which it knoweth not. Therefore, the humble man may search any truth boldly in the Scripture, without any danger of error. And if he be ignorant, he ought the more to read and to search holy Scripture to bring him out of ignorance." "If we read once, twice, or thrice, and understand not, let us not cease so, but still continue reading, praying, asking of

others, and so, by still knocking, at the last the door shall be opened, as St. Augustine saith." " Thus we have briefly touched some part of the commodities of God's holy word, which is one of God's chief and principal benefits, given and declared to mankind here on earth . . . let us hear, read, and know these holy rules, injunctions, and statutes of our Christian religion . . . let us pray to God (the only author of these heavenly studies) that we may speak, think, believe, live, and depart hence according to the wholesome doctrine and verities of them."

Throughout the whole homily, not the most remote hint is given that we are even to consult catholic consent. Among all the directions given for attaining the understanding of Scripture, not one word points to Church tradition. And yet, say our opponents, Church tradition is the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, and is so held to be by the Church of England !

And in the third part of the Homily for Rogation week, we have another very remarkable testimony on this subject. " Nowhere," saith the homily, " can we more certainly search for the knowledge of this will of God . . . but in the holy Scriptures, for they be they that testify of him, saith our Saviour Christ. . . . We see what vanity the school doctrine is mixed with, for that IN THIS WORD they sought not the will of God, but rather the will of reason, the trade of custom, THE PATH OF THE FATHERS, THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH. Let us, therefore, read and revolve the holy Scripture both day and night," &c.

Remarkable, also, is the testimony of our Ordination Services in this matter.

In the Exhortation to priests at their ordination, it is said,—“ Seeing that you cannot by any other means compass the doing of so weighty a work, pertaining to the salvation of man, but with doctrine and exhortation taken *out of the holy Scriptures*, and with a life agreeable to the same ; consider how studious ye ought to be in reading

and learning the Scriptures, and in framing the manners both of yourselves and of them that specially pertain unto you, according to the rule of the same Scriptures."

And they are asked this question,—

"Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures *contain sufficiently all doctrine* required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined, *out of the said Scriptures*, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which *you shall be persuaded* may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?"

Now, had the framers of this Service held the views of our opponents, it is impossible to suppose but that they would have been here recognized. Nay, I would ask how can those who hold such views conscientiously answer this question in the affirmative?

And the same question is repeated in the Service for the consecration of bishops, and is followed by another equally worthy our notice. "Will you, then," adds the Archbishop, "faithfully exercise yourself in the same holy Scriptures, *and call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same*; so as you may be able *by them* to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and to *withstand and convince the gainsayers*?"

Moreover, thus speaks the Apology.

"Thus did the holy Fathers alway fight against the heretics with none other force than with the holy Scriptures. St. Augustine, when he disputed against Petilian, the Donatian heretic, 'Let not these words,' quoth he, be heard between us, I say, or, You say; let us rather speak in this wise, Thus saith the Lord. **THERE LET US SEEK THE CHURCH**, there let us boult out the cause.'" (Pt. 1. ch. 9. div. 1, 2.) "We . . . *refer all our controversies unto the holy Scriptures, and report us to the self same words which we know were sealed by God himself, and in comparison of them set little by all other things, whatsoever may be devised by men.*" (Pt. 1. ch. 10. div. 1.)

“ We receive and embrace all the canonical Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament, giving thanks to our God who hath raised up unto us that light which we might ever have before our eyes, lest either by the subtilty of man, or by the snares of the devil, we should be carried away to errors and lies. Also we profess that these be the heavenly voices whereby God hath opened unto us his will, and that only in them man’s heart can have settled rest, that in them be abundantly and fully comprehended *all things whatsoever be needful for our health*, as Origen, Augustine, Chrysostome, and Cyrillus, have taught, ‘ that they be the very might and strength of God to attain to salvation,’ ‘ that they be the foundations of the Prophets and Apostles,’ whereupon is built the Church of God; that they be *the very sure and infalible rule whereby may be tried* WHETHER THE CHURCH DO SWERVE OR ERR, AND WHEREUNTO ALL ECCLESIASTICAL DOCTRINE OUGHT TO BE CALLED TO ACCOUNT; and that against these Scriptures neither law nor ordinance, nor any custom, ought to be heard; no, though Paul himself, or an angel from heaven, should come and teach the contrary.” (Pt. 2. ch. 9. div. 1.) “ We know well enough that the same word which was opened by Christ and spread abroad by the Apostles, is *sufficient both to our salvation, and also to uphold and maintain all truth, and to confound all manner of heresy*. BY THAT WORD ONLY we do condemn all sorts of the old heretics. . . . As for the Arians . . . and shortly all them which have a wicked opinion either of God the Father, or of Christ, or of the Holy Ghost, or of any other point of Christian religion, *for so much as they be confuted by the gospel of Christ*, we plainly pronounce them for detestable and damned persons.” (Pt. 3. ch. 1. div. 3.) “ Finally, *we in God’s cause desire to stand to God’s only judgment*.” [referring to the Scriptures.] (Pt. 5. ch. 16. div. 7.) “ King Agesilaus did but fondly in this behalf, who, when he had a determinate answer made him of the opinion and will of mighty Jupiter, would afterward bring the whole

matter before Apollo, to know whether he would allow thereof, as his father Jupiter had done, or no. *But yet should we do much more fondly, when we hear God himself PLAINLY speak to us in his most holy Scriptures, and MAY UNDERSTAND BY THEM HIS WILL AND MEANING, if we would afterward, as though this were of none effect, bring our whole cause to be tried by a Council, which were nothing else but to ask whether men would allow as God did, and whether men would confirm God's commandments by their authority.* Why, I beseech you, except a Council will and command, shall not truth be truth, or God be God? If Christ had meant to do so from the beginning, as that he would preach or teach nothing without the Bishop's consent, but refer all his doctrine over to Annas and Caiaphas, where should now have been the Christian faith? or who at any time should have heard the gospel taught? Peter verily, whom the Pope hath oftener in his mouth, and more reverently useth to speak of than he doth of Jesus Christ, did boldly stand against the Holy Council, saying, 'It is better to obey God than men.' And after that Paul had once entirely embraced the gospel, and had received it, 'not from men, nor by man, but by the only will of God, he did not take advice therein of flesh and blood,' nor brought his case before his kinsmen and brethren, but went forthwith into Arabia to preach God's divine mysteries by God's only authority." (Pt. 6. ch. 1. div. 2, 3.)

"Howsoever it be, the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ dependeth not upon Councils, nor, as St. Paul saith, upon the judgments of mortal creatures." (Pt. 6. ch. 18. div. 1.) "We have SEARCHED OUT OF THE HOLY BIBLE, WHICH WE ARE SURE CANNOT DECEIVE US, ONE SURE FORM OF RELIGION, and have returned again unto *the primitive Church of the antient Fathers and Apostles*, that is to say, to the ground and beginning of things, unto the very foundations and headsprings of Christ's Church." (Pt. 6. concl.)

Such is the strong and clear testimony of the Apology

of the Church of England on this matter. While it claims for our Church *agreement* with the primitive Church and the orthodox Fathers, it in the strongest terms insists upon Scripture being considered the sole and entire divine rule of faith and practice.

From Nowell's Catechism we have already quoted a passage conclusive on the point.¹

There is, however, one more testimony to which I would direct the reader's attention on this head, and that is a remarkably clear disclaimer of the doctrine under consideration in the "Reformatio Legum Eccles." It occurs in Tit. 1, chap. 15, entitled, "What is the authority of the holy Fathers," and is as follows,—
 "Lastly, we consider that the authority of the orthodox Fathers is by no means to be despised; for they have many excellent and useful observations. BUT THAT THE HOLY SCRIPTURES SHOULD BE INTERPRETED BY THEIR DECISIONS (ex eorum sententia de sacris literis judicetur) WE DO NOT ALLOW. FOR THE HOLY SCRIPTURES OUGHT TO BE TO US BOTH THE RULES AND JUDGES OF ALL CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. *Nay, moreover, the Fathers themselves refused to be so honoured, frequently admonishing the reader, that he should only admit their determinations and interpretations as far as he should see that they were agreeable to the holy Scriptures.* Let them, therefore, have their due respect and authority, but let it be one which yields, and is in subjection, to the determinations, the truth, and authority of the sacred books."

A more pointed disclaimer of the doctrine maintained by our opponents could hardly be penned.

Moreover, we have evidence that this principle was acted upon by our Reformers. Thus, in the conference held at Westminster between the Romish and the Protestant party in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, after an harangue from Dr. Cole in behalf of the Romanists, it is said, "then the other part was licensed to show their minds, which they did according to the first order, exhi-

¹ See p. 602 above.

biting all that which they meant to propound in a book written, which, after a prayer and invocation made most humbly to Almighty God, for enduing of them with his Holy Spirit, and a protestation also to stand to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, BUILDED UPON THE SCRIPTURES AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE PROPHETS AND THE APOSTLES, was distinctly read," &c.¹

And so, in an address to the Convocation of 1572, by Archbishop Parker, we find that venerable prelate thus speaking;—After alluding to those monuments of the antient British Church which remain to us, and which he says had been “partly destroyed by *Antichrist*,” (ab Antichristo partim deleta,) he adds; “But if divine Providence had not preserved to us those monuments, which ought to be so much dearer to us as they are peculiarly our own, but had permitted them to be utterly destroyed and taken away from the memory of man, yet there remained *the fountains themselves of all divine knowledge*, (totius divinæ scientiæ,) preserved by the grace of the Holy Spirit in the Hebrew and Greek language, to which, after the streams had been so long polluted and perturbed, recurrence would be necessary to have any certain knowledge of the divine will . . . [and then, having quoted the passages from Cyprian’s Epistle to Pompeianus, and Basil’s Letter to Eustathius, given above, pp. 318, 19, and 396, he adds] By the authorities of these holy Fathers we are admonished, that as often as we shall have declined from the holy and immaculate paths of the Lord, through human carelessness and blindness, to return to them again, it is necessary that the holy Scriptures, which bear witness on the point, be searched, and those most antient testimonies be examined, from which, as Cyprian witnesses, the spring and fountain head of our religion arose. *By firmly adhering to these testimonies of divine and holy antiquity, we may be certain respecting the true worship of God and religion, and be safe,*

¹ Wilk. Concil. iv. 192.

although the monuments of human things and ordinances, consumed by the rust of time, may have perished. For these eternal and inviolable fountains are to be assiduously sought day and night; and, by water flowing and derived from these fountains, our wells, which our enemies the Philistines have foully polluted, are to be purified, that they may be filled from these fountains of salvation, whence we may draw eternal life. This subject supplies me with large materials, if I were inclined to dwell upon it, to set before you by what arts *antichrist*¹ has cunningly deceived us," &c. &c.²

Further; there are in the Articles two particular instances in which the doctrine of our Church in this matter is very clearly shown. The first is in its language respecting the creeds; the second in its doctrine respecting the decisions of General Councils. What can have a better claim to be considered as the offspring of what is called catholic consent, and consequently to all the authority which can be hence derived, than the Apostolical and Nicene Creeds? But does our Church receive them on the ground of any supposed authority? Nothing of the kind. The Article distinctly says, "The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is *commonly called* the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for *they may be proved by most*

¹ There was no hesitation *then* in applying this term to Rome. Thus, in reply to some objections to the use of the sacerdotal habit in 1564, the determination "subscribed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, by the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Ely, by Dr. Robinson, chaplain to Parker, and afterwards Bishop of Bangor, by Bickley, another of the Archbishop's chaplains, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, and one Hill, and two other divines," is as follows,—"*Ministri in Ecclesia Anglicana in qua Dei beneficio pura Christi doctrina et fidei Evangelicæ prædicatio jam viget, quæque manifestam detestationem Antichristianismi publice profitetur, sine impietate uti possunt vestium discrimine publica auctoritate jam præscripto, tum in administratione sacra, tum in usu externo, modo omnis cultus et necessitatis opinio amoveatur.*" See Collier, vol. ii. p. 498. And Bishop Patrick says, that the opinion that the Pope is Antichrist, is "the *common opinion* of all [Protestants], some few excepted;" and he proceeds to vindicate it. Answ. to Touchstone, pp. 86, &c.

² Wilk. Concil. iv. 271.

certain warrants of holy Scripture." (Art. 8.) And so in the "Reform. leg. eccl." it is said, "We receive and embrace those three Creeds, BECAUSE they may easily be proved by the strongest testimonies of the divine and canonical Scriptures." (*ista tria Symbola . . . recipimus et amplectimur, quod firmissimis divinarum et canonicarum Scripturarum testimoniis facile probari possint.*) (tit. i, c. 5.) And on this ground Bishop Pearson distinctly places our reception of the Apostles' Creed.¹

The force of this argument will, upon consideration, be found peculiarly strong. For there is no "tradition" of the early Church so well authenticated, so likely to be a really catholic tradition, as the Nicene Creed. If, then, our Church receives this only because she believes that its declarations may be proved by Scripture, *a fortiori*, she gives no better entertainment to any other "tradition." In a word, with Augustine, she yields altogether the notion of any intrinsic *authority* belonging to it.

Again; whence can we form a better judgment of the views of the primitive Church, than from the decrees of the early General Councils? But does our Church hold that those decrees are, in themselves and intrinsically, of authority, binding the consciences of men? On the contrary, our Church expressly declares,—"*General Councils may not be gathered together, without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.*" (Art. 21.)

And hence the Act of 1 Elizabeth, 1. in which the decrees of the first four Councils were made rules to the High Commission Court for judging heresy, is thus cautiously worded,—It is provided by it that nothing shall be considered heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so "by the *authority* of the canonical Scriptures, or by

¹ See his Exposition of it.

[*not*, by the *authority* of,] the first four General Councils," &c.

So in the "*Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*," it is said,—"*Moreover, although we willingly give great honour to Councils, especially General Councils, yet we consider that they are all of them to be placed far below the dignity of the canonical Scriptures. And, moreover, we make a great difference between the Councils themselves. For some of them, such as those four principal, the Nicene, the first of Constantinople, the Ephesine and the Chalcedonian, we embrace and accept with great reverence. And we have the same opinion of many others which were afterwards held, in which we see and confess that the most holy Fathers ordained many things with great judgment and piety, agreeably to the divine Scriptures, concerning the blessed and most high Trinity, concerning Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, and the redemption of man procured by him. Nevertheless, we consider that our faith is no otherwise bound to them, than so far as they can be confirmed from the holy Scriptures. For it is manifest that some Councils have sometimes erred, and decreed contrary to each other; partly in legal causes, partly also in the faith. Therefore let the Councils be read with honour and Christian respect, but meanwhile let them be examined by the holy, certain, and right rule of the Scriptures* (ad Scripturarum piam, certam, rectamque regulam examinentur.)" (Tit. i. c. 14.)

Hence both Bishop Burnet and Bishop Tomline repudiate the notion of our Church considering herself bound by the authority of the decrees of any Councils. "*For the four General Councils,*" says Bishop Burnet, "*which this Church declares she receives, they are received only because we are persuaded from the Scriptures, that their decisions are made according to them: That the Son is truly God, &c. . . . these truths we find in the Scriptures; and therefore we believe them. We reverence those Councils for the sake of their doctrine; but do not believe the doctrine for the authority of the Councils.*" (Expos. Art. 21.) To the same effect, also, speaks Bishop Tomline.

So, also, in the Treatise on the Authority of Councils, by Dr. Clagett and Mr. Hutchinson, inserted by Bishop Gibson in his "Preservative," it is said :—" Our Church has a reverent esteem for the four first General Councils ; we embrace their confessions of faith ; and whatsoever they defined to be heresy, we judge to be so. *If it be demanded why we approve of them, and not of all the rest, we answer, Because their determinations in matters of faith, are manifestly warranted by the holy Scriptures.*"¹

And that such is the doctrine of our Church, is made a charge against her by the Romanists. Thus speaks the able Roman Catholic writer, Abraham Woodhead, than whom no one was better versed in the writings of our divines ; " The Church of England, indeed, professeth her assent to the definitions of the first four General Councils . . . but you may observe that this assent is not yielded to those Councils because lawfully general, and so presumed to be assisted by our Lord in the right defining and delivery of all necessary faith . . . but because the matter defined by them—the Church of England being for herself judge hereof—ought to be assented to, as being agreeable to the Scripture ; and the assent is *not yielded for the authority defining*, as infallibly assisted in necessities, but for the appearing evidence in Scripture of the thing defined, or at least for the non-appearing evidence of the contrary ; the assent not yielded, because that particular persons or Churches are *to take that for the true sense of Scripture which these Councils may possibly give of it, but because those Councils gave in their definitions that sense of Scripture which such particular persons or Churches judge the true* ; so that the reason which they give for their assent to these General Councils, obligeth as much their assent to them, had they been provincial . . . To this purpose, see the 21st Art. of the Church of England, ' General Councils may err,' &c. See the Acts of Parliament 1 Elizabeth, c. 1. [and then adding quotations from *Dr. Fern, Archbishop Laud, Dr. Field, Dr. Hammond,*

¹ Gibson's Preserv. vol. i. Tit. iv. c. 2. p. 141.

Mr. Chillingworth, Archbishop Potter, Dr. Whitby, and Bishop Stillingfleet, he adds,] From these quotations, I think it appears that whatever fair professions are made, yet no assent is given by them to the first four Councils on this account, that they could not err in their definitions, nor yet because they are their sovereign judge, from whose sentence they may not dissent, if they be persuaded that it is repugnant to the Scriptures."¹

That our Church receives the decrees of the first four General Councils, I willingly allow; though, while I am upon the subject, I would offer a remark on the grounds on which such a position may be maintained, as I am not sure that those upon which it is commonly placed, are sufficient.

In the Act of 1 Elizabeth, 1, it was provided that judges ecclesiastical "shall not in anywise have authority or power to order, determine, or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresie, but only such as have heretofore been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be heresie, by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other General Council wherein the same was declared heresie by the *express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures*; or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be heresie, by the High Court of Parliament of this realm, with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation."² On which Hooker observes, that "the credit which those four General Councils have throughout all Churches evermore had, was judged by the makers of the foresaid Act, a just cause wherefore they should be mentioned in that case as a requisite part of the rule where-with dominion was to be *limited*."³ And the clause, though merely restrictive, certainly shows that the decrees of the first four General Councils on the subject of heresy,

¹ A Rational Account of the doctrine of Roman Catholics concerning the ecclesiastical Guide in controversies of religion by R. H. [i. e. Abraham Woodhead] 2nd edit. 1673, pp. 174—9.

² Gibson's Codex, p. 48 and 352.

³ Eccl. Pol. Book 8. c. 2.

were received by our Reformed Church; and clearly enabled those to whom the Act referred, to pronounce anything to be heresy, which had been defined to be so by any one of those Four Councils. And "the ground," says Bishop Gibson, "of making this limitation, was a retrospect to the times of Popery, in which everything was adjudged heresie, that the Church of Rome thought fit to call by that name; how far soever in its own nature from being fundamental, and how contrary soever to the Gospel, and the antient doctrine of the Catholic Church."¹

But as this Act was repealed in 1640, and that part of the Act relating to the High Commission Court containing this clause, never re-enacted, this clause, has, of course, no power now. It related only to the Court of High Commission, whose proceedings were to be regulated by it.

Still it no doubt shows the sense of Convocation and Parliament on the subject at the time; and hence it is said by Lord Coke, "Albeit this provisoe extendeth only to the High Commissioners; yet seeing, in the High Commission there be so many bishops and other divines and learned men, it may serve for a good direction to others, especially to the diocesan, being a sole judge in so weighty a cause."² And it is on that account, I suppose, that it is said in 1 Hawkins 4, quoted in Burn's Eccl. Law, vol. 2, Art. *Heresy*, that it "hath been generally holden" that "these rules [i. e. those in 1 Eliz. 1.] will be good directions to Ecclesiastical Courts in relation to heresy."

There is but one other reference, as far as I am aware, in any public document of our Reformed Church to the early Councils, and that is in the Canons of 1640; in which it is said that Socinianism is "a complication of many antient heresies, condemned by the first four General Councils, and contrariant to the Articles of religion now established in the Church of England." This reference, again, is, to a certain extent, evidence that the decrees of those Councils were received by our Church; but

¹ Codex, p. 352.

² 3 Inst. 4. See Gibson's Codex, i. 351.

nothing more. And as we have already observed,¹ the Canons of 1640 are of no force.²

It must be admitted, then, that these are but very indirect and inadequate authorities for any bishop or ecclesiastical court to act upon; and I suspect that a safer ground in any matter of legal cognizance, would be the Act of 25 Hen. viii. c. 19, quoted above.³

That Act, as we have seen, allowed such canons of the English Church, already made, as were not repugnant to the laws, &c. to remain in force. Among these were the following passed in the National Council of Chalchythe in 785. This Council was assembled by the legates of Pope Adrian, who, in an account of the Council sent to the Pope, give the Canons they proposed; and which they say the King and all the clergy nobles and people, bound themselves faithfully to observe.

The first of these is as follows,—“That the holy and inviolate faith of the Nicene Council be faithfully and firmly held by all who are devoted to the holy service; and that every year in the Synodal meetings the priests of every Church, who ought to instruct the people, be very diligently examined by the bishops concerning the faith, so that they may in all things confess, hold, and preach the Apostolical Catholic faith of the Six Synods, which is approved by the Holy Ghost, as it is delivered to us by the holy Roman Church; and if there be occasion, not fear to die for it; and that they receive all such men as the holy General Councils have received, and heartily reject and condemn all whom they have condemned.” And in the fourth occurs the following passage,—“Wherefore we advise that the Synodal edicts of the six General Councils, together with the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, be often read, and be observed; and that the state of the Church be reformed, according to their pattern; so that nothing new be allowed to be introduced by any, that there

¹ See note, p. 600 above.

² See Gibson's Codex, and Stillingfleet's Cases.

³ See p. 600 above.

be no schism in the Church of God.”¹ These canons and decrees, therefore, are considered to have thus become “the Code of the English Church;”² and, no doubt, such was the case in the times of Popery;—and so far as these canons and decrees are not repugnant to the legally acknowledged doctrine of our Church in her Articles, Homilies, &c. so far they may be considered in force still in the English Church.

The decrees and canons of the first four General Councils were, also, made by Justinian part of the civil code;³ and the civil law was, as is well known, received and practised to a considerable extent in this country.

These four Councils are also put forward in the Common Canon Law, as deserving *particular* reverence;⁴ though, of course, not as the only ones to be obeyed. Indeed, the 5th and 6th, and even the first eight, are in the context almost equally honoured.⁵

And to these directions of the Canon Law, our own

¹ Wilk. i. 146, 7.

² Johnson's Clergyman's Vade Mecum, Pt. 2. Pref. p. cxii.

³ Thus speaks that Code,—“Sancimus igitur vicem legum obtinere sanctas Ecclesiasticas regulas quæ a sanctis quatuor Conciliis expositæ sunt aut firmatæ, hoc est in Nicæna trecentorum decem et octo, et in Constantinopolitana sanctorum centum quinquaginta Patrum, et in Ephesina prima in qua Nestorius est damnatus, et in Chalcedonia in qua Eutyches cum Nestorio anathematizatus est. Prædictarum enim quatuor synodorum dogmata sicut sanctas Scripturas accipimus, et regulas sicut leges observamus. Justin. Novell. 131. c. 1.

⁴ Thus in the Decree of Gratian, it is said,—“Inter cætera autem Concilia quatuor esse scimus venerabiles Synodos quæ totam principaliter fidem complectuntur, quasi quatuor Evangelia, vel totidem Paradisi flumina;” and having enumerated the Nicene, Constantinopolitan, Ephesine, and Chalcedonian, it proceeds,—“Hæ sunt quatuor Synodi principales, fidei doctrinam plenissime prædicantes. Sed et si qua sunt alia Concilia quæ sancti Patres Spiritu Dei pleni sanxerunt, post istorum quatuor auctoritatem omni manent stabilita vigore, quorum gesta in hoc opere condita continentur.” Dist. 15. c. 1.

⁵ Thus among the extracts given by Gratian, is the following from the declaration to be made by the Pope at his installation, given in the “Liber Diurnus,”—“Sancta octo universalis Concilia, id est, primum Nicænum, secundum Constantinopolitanum, tertium Ephesinum, quartum Chalcedonense, item quintum Constantinopolitanum et sextum, item Nicænum septimum, octavum quoque Constantinopolitanum, usque ad unum apicem immutata servare, et pari honore et veneratione digna habere, et quæ prædicaverunt et

Lyndwood refers in his "Provinciale," as showing what Councils were received by *the Church at large*. Speaking of the Council of Chalcedon, he says,—“Such General Councils represent the Universal Church, which is called Catholic. See 15th Dist. throughout; where, in the chapter commencing *Sancta Romana*, are enumerated the Councils and works which are received *throughout the Church*. Of the approved Councils, also, some remarks are made in the 16th Dist. in the chapter commencing *Sexta Synodus*, and as it were throughout.”¹

These remarks of Lyndwood seem clearly to show that the directions of the common canon law on this point, were received here; and no doubt, in matters of *faith*, they must have been considered as *obligatory*, on account of the sanction given to the common canon law by the Pope. But as the canons of these Councils, with the exception of the first six, are nowhere recognised by our own domestic canon law, (excepting, perhaps, in some particulars legalized by Act of Parliament or custom,) they, of course, have had no authority since the Reformation.

The decrees of the first six Councils, then, having been received by our own Church, are allowed by the 25 Hen. viii. c. 19, so far as they are not repugnant to the laws of the realm, those laws which have established the Articles, Homilies, &c. as the doctrine of the Church of England.

Further, let us observe the terms in which heresy is spoken of in various ecclesiastical documents, affording evidence, more or less important, of the doctrine of our Church.

In Archbishop Cranmer's "Articles to be inquired of in the visitations to be had within the diocese of Canter-

statuerunt modis omnibus sequi et prædicare, quæque condemnauerunt ore et corde condemnare profiteor." Dist. 16. c. 8.

¹ Talia concilia generalia repræsentant universalem Ecclesiam quæ dicitur Catholica. 15. Di. per totum, ubi in c. *Sancta Romana* recitantur Concilia et etiam opuscula quæ admittuntur per Ecclesiam. De conciliis quoque approbatis habetur 16. Di. c. *Sexta Synodus* et quasi per totum. Provinc. lib. v. tit. 4. c. *Reverendissima* verb. *per ecclesiam*. p. 284. ed. 1679.

bury" in 1547, the question on this matter is, "Whether any have wilfully maintained and defended any heresies, errors, or false opinions contrary to *the faith of Christ and holy Scripture*."¹ The same is repeated *verbatim* in the Visitation Articles in the first year of Queen Elizabeth.² So in Archbishop Parker's Metropolitcal Visitation Articles a. 1567, one is, "You shall inquire of the doctrine and judgment of all and singular, head and members of your Church . . . whether any of them do either privily or openly preach or teach any unwholesome, erroneous, seditious doctrine, or discourage any man from the reading of the holy Scriptures soberly, for his edifying, or, &c. . . . [enumerating several errors, and then concluding], or any other errors or false doctrine, contrary to *the faith of Christ and holy Scriptures*."³

And so in the service for the ordination of priests, published in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, it is asked, "Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, *contrary to God's word*?" and in that for the consecration of bishops, "Be you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, *contrary to God's word*, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?"

And in the "*Reformatio legum eccles.*" the definition of heresy is as follows,—“We ordain that all those are to be accounted heretics, who hold any doctrine of our common faith, otherwise than is determined in *holy Scripture*, and so persist in their error, that they will not suffer themselves to be driven from it.”⁴

And what says one who looked at this matter merely with the eye of a lawyer, weighing the evidence upon which it would be legally determined? “It seemeth that among Protestants, heresy is taken to be a false opinion,

¹ Wilk. Concil. iv. 25.

² Ib. iv. 190.

³ Ib. iv. 253.

⁴ Tit. 2. c. 1.

repugnant to some point of doctrine *clearly revealed in Scripture*, and either absolutely essential to the Christian faith, or at least of most high importance.”¹

Not one word is to be found in any public document of our Church, intimating that catholic consent is the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, or a part of the rule of faith; which, had our Church held it to be so, must necessarily have been mentioned in the places quoted above. The determination of heresy and error, according to our Church, rests upon the authority of Scripture, and Scripture only. And the authorized guides in our Church for the interpretation of Scripture, and by which, of course, *her members* must be judged, are the Articles, homilies, catechism, liturgy, canons of 1603, and those canons, &c. received previous to the Reformation, which are not contrary to the laws, or the king’s prerogative; among which are to be found the three Creeds, received because they “may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture;” and the first six Councils, *so far as* they are not contrary to the doctrines legally established; and of these, particularly the first four, on account of the recognition given them in the Act of 1 Eliz. 1; but none of them on the ground of any intrinsic authority. (Art. 21.)

And hence these received guides are occasionally joined with the Scriptures as the tests of error and heresy *in our Church*. Thus, in Archbishop Parker’s Metropolitcal Articles of 1569, the inquiry is, “Whether there be in your parishes any suspected of heresy, or that maintain any erroneous opinions contrary to *the laws of Almighty God and good religion, by public authority in this realm set forth*.”² And so, in the Act of 1 Eliz. 1, and the Canons of 1640, the decrees of the first four General Councils are referred to as tests. And in the Directions to the archbishops and bishops by William III., a. 1695, (Tenison archbishop,) it is ordered, “That no preacher whatsoever in his sermon or lecture, do pre-

¹ Hawkins’s Pleas of the Crown, title Heresy, quoted by Burn.

² Wilk. Concil. iv. 259.

sume to deliver any other doctrine concerning the blessed Trinity, than what is *contained in the holy Scriptures, and is agreeable to the three Creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles of religion* ;"¹ a direction which was repeated in the same words by George I. in 1714,² and again in 1721.

It does not appear, however, that Church tradition or catholic consent has ever been in any way or degree *recognized* by our Church. And the only notice taken by her of the writings of the Fathers (except the Creeds and the first four Councils) is in the requirement contained in the (unauthoritative) Canon of 1571 ; the propriety of which is hardly called in question by any one.

In short, the doctrine of our Church on this point is very well described in a document of the early date of 1539,—which I do not quote as authority, because it is not known by whom it was drawn up, but which probably did not proceed from a common hand, as it is preserved in the State Paper Office,—entitled, “ A Declaration of the faith, and a justification of the proceedings, of King Henry the Eighth in matters of religion, or a summary declaration of the faith, uses, and observations in England,” in which the fourth paragraph runs thus,—“ Englishmen styk fast to the doctrine of God in the New Testament, and in the Old, conformeable to the New ; and do esteeme that it is, *Fons aquæ salientis in vitam eternam* ; also they do accept the holy counccills and doctors, *where they be not contrary, but conformeable unto the same doctrine.*”³

Hence, then, we may see the true *via media* held by our Church in this matter, between the Romanists on one hand, and the despisers of antiquity on the other.

The doctrines which we receive, we believe on the authority of Scripture, and Scripture only ; while we at the same time assert that, from the records of antiquity which remain to us, we have every reason to suppose that these were the doctrines of the primitive orthodox Church. And we maintain, further, that a doctrine, though pro-

¹ Ib. iv. 625.

² Ib. 666.

³ See Collier, vol. ii. Records, No. 47.

fessedly derived from Scripture, pretending to be vitally important, which can find no support in the records that remain to us of the orthodox primitive Church, is open to very strong suspicion. Nay more, considering the extent and nature of the writings that remain to us of the first four or five centuries, we may safely maintain, (and it is a useful practical check upon novel extravagances to maintain, with the Canon of 1571,) that no doctrine ought to be admitted as an important doctrine of religion, that cannot find some support in the writings of the Catholic Fathers of the first five centuries. But this is maintained (as we have already observed) not on any theoretical view of the impossibility of these writings neglecting to set forth any important doctrine, or being worded so as to appear to countenance any error, but as a practical direction arising from an inspection of them, and a belief that the orthodox faith is to be found in them. As it is expressed by Dr. Waterland, in a passage already quoted. "The Protestants," he says, "having *well studied the Fathers*, were *now* willing to rest their cause not upon Scripture only, but Fathers too."¹ And the same view is taken in other passages, which we shall quote presently.²

In arguing, then, with opponents of our Church on fundamental points, in the explanation of which we differ, after having pressed them with arguments derived from Scripture, our only *authority* and *rule of faith*, we add confirmations of our views from the records of the primitive Church, offering them to the *Romanists* as *upon their own principles conclusive* in our favour, and to *others*, as *moral confirmations* in favour of them, of a very strong character.

To the *Romanists*, when they accuse us of paying no regard to antiquity, we say, show us any vital doctrine established by even probable consent of the primitive Church which we do not receive, or any which we do receive, unsupported by the records of that Church. Our creed is precisely that of the primitive Church, as

¹ See vol. i. p. 222.

See pp. 626—8 below.

far as it can be ascertained. True, we take it from the Scriptures, and rest it upon the authority of the Scriptures only, but we look with great respect to the records of the primitive Church, and value highly their confirmation of our views, and we think it a good argument against such and such doctrines of yours, that they are utterly destitute of support in the records of the primitive Church, and in the conviction that they are altogether destitute of Scripture proof, and many of them opposed to Scripture, we at once reject them; all of them as vitally important doctrines, and some as anti-christian.

Moreover, the same ground is taken by our Church (as the preceding extracts show) with respect to the fundamentals of *practice*; on which point we have already had occasion to make some remarks,¹ and therefore add nothing here.

To those *sectaries* who may suspect us of putting forward the statements of Fathers and early Councils as part of the divine rule of faith or practice, because we profess to agree with them, and point to them in *confirmation* of the truth of our doctrines and the propriety of some of our observances, we reply,—We do no such thing; Scripture is with us the sole and complete authoritative rule of faith, and sole divine rule of practice; we receive even the antient creeds only because they may be “proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture;” we regard the testimony of Fathers and early Councils only as a *confirmation* of the truth of our doctrines, or the propriety of our observances, though obviously a very important confirmation; and we affirm that any doctrine, though professedly derived from Scripture, pretending to be a vital point, which can get no confirmation from the writings of the primitive Church, is open to very strong suspicion, and further (considering the nature and extent of the writings of the first four or five centuries) we hold practically that any doctrine which has no support in them is not to be admitted as a vital point.

¹ See pp. 25—29 above.

We are, therefore, attacked by the one party for not admitting the *authority* of the primitive Church as *supreme*, and by the other often for paying it any respect at all.

When, therefore, in reasoning with the Romanists, our divines may seem to refer to the testimony of antiquity as settling the point in dispute with authority and beyond appeal, so far as that testimony appears to be used as an *authoritative* argument, and one that *binds the conscience, and demands faith*, so far is the argument an *argumentum ad hominem*; it is meeting the Romanist on his own principles, and fighting the battle with him on ground chosen by himself; and, considering the strength of the Protestant cause, it is ground which may be occupied without fear.

To show that I am not speaking without authority when I say this, I will give some quotations from works written by our divines when engaged in such a controversy, to prove the truth of it.

Thus speaks one of the writers to whom Bishop Gibson has assigned his place in his great work against Popery. "Though *the Scripture* be our only rule of faith and doctrine necessary to be believed by us, because we know of *no other revelation* but that, and nothing but revelation makes any doctrine necessary to be believed, yet we are very willing to take the sense and meaning of Scripture both from itself and from the primitive Church too." . . . "Here is a very large scope offered to me, and what has taken up a great many volumes on both sides; so that to most people Scripture one would think should be *a shorter and an easier, and therefore a better, way to know the true Church by*; but SINCE OUR ADVERSARIES ARE NOT WILLING TO LEAVE THE CAUSE TO THAT, we are *ready to accept of the primitive Church* to be judge between us; and as has been often offered before by Bishop Jewell and others, we shall be very willing to stand to its award and decision. For however some few divines of the Reformation, before they were so well acquainted with antiquity, and when they could not so well distinguish what was genuine from what was spurious and corrupted by

your Church, were at first especially more jealous and distrustful than they need to have been of it, and unwilling to venture their cause to any other sentence but that of Scripture, which had so plainly decided for them, and WAS INDEED THE MOST PROPER TO BE APPEALED TO; yet the greatest number and the most learned of the Protestant writers have never declined the judgment of the primitive Church, but next to the inspired writings of the Apostles have always esteemed and been willing to be determined by it. And we are well assured that *the antient Church*, even the Roman itself, as well as the whole Christian besides, is in all material points on the *Protestant side*.” —“*When we produce Scripture against our adversaries, we then produce the only authentic records of the Apostolic Church, and the only certain account we have of the faith and doctrine of the most primitive Church. Let them object therefore never so much against Scripture as a rule of faith, yet whilst it contains THE ONLY SURE TESTIMONY of what was taught and believed by the first Christian Church, so far as any of these doctrines are not in Scripture, so far they cannot appear to be the doctrine of the Apostolic Church; and whilst we hold all that faith and all those doctrines that are contained in Scripture, we hold all that can be known to be so in the most pure and most primitive Church; and whatsoever they have added to Scripture, which they will needs have to be but an imperfect rule of faith, they have added, so far as can be known, to the doctrine of the Apostolic Church. For if Scripture be not the only rule of that [i. e. the doctrine of the Apostolic Church], yet it is the only historical account we have of it.*”¹

And so Bishop Stillingfleet, in his examination of the Council of Trent, says,—“The UTMOST use I can suppose, then, Vincentius his rules can be of to us now is in that case which he puts when corruptions and errors have had time to take root and fasten themselves, and

¹ Bellarmine's Notes of the Church examined, &c. by Dr. Sherlock and others, in Bishop Gibson's Preservative, Tit. iii. c. 2. pp. 104—7.

that is, By an appeal to Scripture and antient Councils. *But* BECAUSE OF THE CHARGE OF INNOVATION against us, we are content to be tried by his second rule, by the consent of the Fathers of greatest reputation," &c.¹

And thus is the same sentiment briefly and pithily expressed by Dr. Sherman, in a work which has the high recommendation of Bishop Hall affixed to it. His Roman Catholic adversary says,—“Your doctors would fain dispute out of Scripture only.” To which Dr. S. replies,—“If *only* be taken in order to the ultimate resolution of faith, we would indeed dispute out of Scripture only, because the principles of Scripture are only to us infallible, but if *only* be taken exclusively to all *use* of the Fathers, we deny it. To show that our doctrine is truly divine, we prove it out of Scripture : to show that it is not new, we compare it with the sayings of the Fathers ; yea, the judgment of the Fathers hath itself to faith as a *rational disposition*, but *not as an inerrable determination* ; this privilege we reserve to Scripture, which is to us the formal object and ground of divine faith.”²

Other similar testimonies may be had in abundance.

To sum up all, then, in a few words, the position taken by the Church of England with respect to the use to be made of the writings of the Fathers appears to be this.

1. That the absence of any testimony in favour of a point proposed as vitally important in the writings that remain to us of the Catholic Fathers of the first five or six centuries, (for here we must take a somewhat lengthened period on account of the paucity of the remains of the earliest Church,) is in itself, and ought to be *to all men*, whatever their views may be, a very strong argument against it ; and, on the contrary, that very general testimony in favour of any vitally important point in those writings, (always including here those of the first two or three centuries,) is to all men a very strong argument in favour of it.

¹ Council of Trent examined, &c. p. 24.

² Account of faith, &c. by J. S. 1661. pp. 633, 4.

Further 2. Our Church holding that all vitally important points are, *in fact*, contained and expressed in the writings of those who are called the catholic doctors of the first few centuries, has warned *her ministers* not to bring forward anything as vitally important which does not find some support in those writings.¹

And 3. Conscious that the writings of those Fathers, and the information we can gather from them as to the doctrines of the primitive Church, preponderate beyond comparison in her favour, she is at all times ready to meet the Romanists, or any other pseudo-catholics, on their own ground, and to let the Fathers be judges between us.

It remains for us to see what countenance our Church affords to the notion of our possessing articles of revelation of minor importance not contained at all in Scripture.

Our opponents contend that the 6th Article speaks only of points necessary to salvation. But its words seem not so limited. It tells us, as we have just seen, that what is not read in Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, "is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as *an article of the faith*." And the attempt to explain this away, by understanding the phrase "the faith" to mean only the fundamentals of the faith, and to maintain that there are nevertheless articles of *religious belief* to be held by us that are not in Scripture, is surely a mode of dealing with the Article worthy only of censure and reprobation.

But however this may be, we have abundant other evidence. Thus the first homily says,—“In holy Scripture is *fully* contained what we ought *to do* and what to eschew, what *to believe*, what to love and what to look for at God's hands at length.” “Nowadays,” says the Apology, “the holy Scripture is abroad, the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are in print, whereby all truth

¹ This warning, however, it must be observed, is given only in a Canon of Convocation, of no authority. But no doubt it is agreeable to the spirit in which our church and her great divines have upon the whole acted, and is well founded, and not without its use.

and catholic doctrine may be proved, and all heresy may be disproved and confuted." (Pt. 1. c. 8. div. 1.) And again; "We profess that in them [i. e. the Scriptures] be abundantly and fully comprehended all things whatsoever be *needful for our health*." (Pt. 2. c. 9. div. 1.) So Nowell's Catechism. "We are admonished not to follow or seek for anything in religion beyond what we are there [i. e. in the Scripture] taught by God." "Do you affirm, then, that all things necessary to *piety* and salvation are contained in God's written word? A. Certainly, for it would be the part of intolerable impiety and madness to think either that God had left an imperfect doctrine, or that men could complete what he had left imperfect." So that all the doctrine which "God has left" us, is contained in the Scriptures. And so, finally, the "Reformatio leg. eccl.;" — "From the Scriptures alone the doctrines of *religion* and faith ought to be made up (constare) and confirmed," (tit. 1. c. 6,) which is clearly saying, in other words, that Scripture is the only source of all religious truth.

In reply to the *fourth* position, asserting the necessity of tradition on account of the obscurity of Scripture, even in the fundamental articles, we may refer to the testimonies already given on the second, particularly the following,—

"The humble man may search any truth boldly in the Scripture, without any danger of error. And if he be ignorant, he ought the more to read and to search holy Scripture to bring him out of ignorance." (Hom.) "We hear God himself PLAINLY speak to us in his most holy Scriptures, and *may understand by them his will and meaning*." (Apol.) Indeed, all the testimonies there given, directly or indirectly negative the position before us. We may add to them the following. "Although many things in Scripture be spoken in obscure mysteries," says the Homily, "yet there is nothing spoken under dark mysteries in one place, but the self-same thing in other places is spoken more familiarly and plainly, to the capacity both of learned and unlearned. And those things

in the Scripture that be plain to understand and necessary for salvation, every man's duty is to learn them, to print them in memory, and effectually to exercise them. And as for the dark mysteries, to be contented to be ignorant in them, until such time as it shall please God to open those things unto him."

And in direct opposition to Mr. Keble's statement, that for "the catholic doctrine of the most holy Trinity, as contained in the Nicene Creed," we are indebted to "the unwritten teaching of the first age of the Church," (see pp. 32 and 41,) the homily says,— "In these books [i. e. the Scriptures] we shall find the Father from whom, the Son by whom, and the Holy Ghost in whom, all things have their being and keeping up, and these three persons to be but one God and *one substance*."

And so, in the "Declaration of certain principal Articles of religion," published in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, and required to be read by "all parsons, vicars, and curates," twice a-year, the second Article is, "I believe, also, whatsoever is contained in the holy canonical Scriptures, in the which Scriptures are contained all things necessary to salvation, *by the which, also, all errors and heresies may sufficiently be reprov'd and convicted, and all doctrine and articles necessary to salvation established.*"¹

As it respects the *fifth* position,—that it is on the authority of Church-tradition that we must rest the canon and inspiration of Scripture, and the genuineness of what we receive as such,—it is sufficient to remark, that our Church gives not the smallest countenance to such a notion. If, indeed, the testimonies adduced on the former points have (as we trust they have) shown that our Church does not admit the authority of tradition, or what is called catholic consent, as binding the conscience to the belief of what it testifies, there needs no further proof that she does not consider herself bound to accept the Scriptures as the word of God on that authority. The reception of

¹ Wilk. Concil. iv. 195.

these books by the primitive Church is of course a necessary and indispensable part of the testimony upon which our reception of them depends; but that, not on the ground of any authority in the witness so borne, such that it should of itself bind us to belief in what it delivers, but because, had they doubted the claims of any book to be inserted in the canon, the historical evidence in its favour would have been imperfect and insufficient. And hence it was that our Church rejected from the canon several books which had been admitted into it by the Church of Rome.

The doctrine of our Church upon this point, however, will more fully appear in the testimonies which I am about to quote respecting the whole subject from the writings of some of her most eminent divines; to which I now proceed. And the first we have to notice is that of

BISHOP JEWELL.

To find the name of this venerable Prelate and champion of Protestantism, called by Hooker, "the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years,"¹ so associated, is indeed passing strange. The passages already quoted from the "Apology of the Church of England," written by him, make any further reference to his works almost needless; but it may have its use to those who are unacquainted with his sentiments.

The testimony quoted from him by Mr. Keble, is of course his famous challenge to the Romanists, calling upon them to point out any passage in any author of the first six centuries who supported their views and customs on certain points, and he would yield the question. For this, and this alone, Mr. Keble quotes him as a defender of his system! He must be driven to great straits to find witnesses to give his system a character. If he had only read to the end of the sermon from which he has quoted this challenge, he would have seen that his wit-

¹ Eccl. Pol. ii. 6.

ness altogether fails him. For at the close of the sermon, after quoting some passages from Ambrose, Cyprian, and Tertullian, directing us to the holy Scriptures as our guide and rule of faith, he adds,—“ O that our adversaries, and all they that stand in defence of the masse this day, would content themselves to be judged by this rule ! O THAT, IN ALL THE CONTROVERSIES THAT LIE BETWEEN US AND THEM, THEY WOULD REMIT THE JUDGMENT UNTO GOD’S WORD ! So should we soon agree and join together. *So should we deliver nothing unto the people but that we have received at God’s hand.*” And in his correspondence with Dr. Cole respecting this very challenge, at the close of his last letter he says,—“ O Master Doctor, let us lay aside all self-will and contention, *and have recourse only unto the truth that God hath revealed to us in his holy word. For thereby shall ye be able to know whether the Church do right or no. And thereby shall ye be able to reform her if she happen to do amiss. . . .* Thus Christ reformed the errors of the Church in his time, brought in by the Scribes and Pharisees, and said unto them, *Scriptum est . . .* [and then, after having quoted some passages from the Fathers as before, he adds] To conclude, like as the errors of the clock be revealed by the constant course of the sun, even so *the errors of the Church* are revealed by *the everlasting and infallible word of God.*”¹

These passages clearly show that he had no intention, when making his challenge, of setting up the authority of the Fathers as any part of the rule of faith or supreme Judge of controversies. But when the Romanists boasted of their antiquity, to drive them even from this plea, he challenges them to produce any proof of it; and to show the certainty of his conviction that they could not do so, he offers to yield the cause to them, if they were able to do so.

We will not, however, dismiss so able and venerable a witness so hastily, especially as he has elsewhere still

¹ Works, p. 44.

more plainly and forcibly expressed his views on the points under discussion, as we will now proceed to show.

As it respects, then, the first three of the positions maintained by the Tractators, the following statements are, I suppose, sufficiently decisive.

“What shall a godly-disposed simple man do? How shall he settle himself? To which side may he safely join himself? If he make reckoning of learning, there are learned men on both sides; if he make reckoning of virtue and godly life, there be virtuous men and of godly life on both sides; if he make reckoning of zeal, either side is zealous in the religion they hold; if he make reckoning of the name of the Church, they take it as well to the one side as to the other; if he make reckoning of the multitude, there are many on either side, but neither side hath so many as hath the Turk. Whither, then, may a man turn himself, and to which side may he safely join? In this case we find the comfort and profit of *the word of God*. In this case St. Paul telleth us, ‘Whatsoever things are written aforetime are written for our learning,’ to lighten our eyes, to resolve our doubts, and to guide our feet. . . . With this word Christ confounded the Scribes and Pharisees, and put them to silence. . . . *This word* confounded the Arians and all sorts of heretics. What is become of Marcion, of Nestorius? . . . they are blown away as smoke before the wind, *the word of God* hath confounded them, and beat them away. As Dagon fell, and broke his hands and neck, and could not stand in the presence of the ark of the Lord, even so shall all falsehood fall and hide itself in the presence of the truth of God. As the rod of Moses devoured the rods of the charmers, as the beams of the sun drive away and consume darkness, so shall the word of God chase away errors. . . . They [i. e. “*the Scriptures*”] bring us to God; *teach us the truth*, and give us reason of all things; they keep us in safety, suffer not wolves to devour us, keep off heretics, bewray a thief, and make known who is antichrist. . . . And as the

word of God is the light to direct us, and to bewray errors, so is it also the standard and beam to try the weights of truth and falsehood. . . . The master of the ship, when he is on the main sea, casteth his eye always upon the load star, and so directeth and guideth his ways. Even so must we, which are passengers and strangers in this world, ever settle our eyes to behold the word of God. So shall no tempest overblow us, so shall we be guided without danger, so shall we safely arrive in the haven of our rest. . . . This is *THE rule of our faith*; without this our faith is but a fantasie, and no faith, for faith is by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. Therefore Christ saith, ‘Search the Scriptures, they are they that testify of me.’ There shall ye find testimony of my doctrine, there shall ye know what is the will of my heavenly Father, and there shall you receive the comfort for everlasting life.”¹

“Forasmuch as it cannot be doubted among Christian men that Christ and his Apostles appointed the Church in their time in such sort as no better could be devised, let us compare the Church of late time and that original; as the use is, in trying of measures, where in trial whether is true or false, ye have evermore recourse to *the standard*; for if there be any fault, whatsoever it be, the standard will bewray it. This order Christ himself used with the priests and pharisees. . . . By this standard Christ reproveth the Sadducees; ‘You err, not knowing the Scriptures.’ And by the same he confuted the devil when he came to tempt him; ‘It is written.’ This standard shall be able to warrant us, if we can say truly, ‘It is written.’ For as the learned Father Irenæus saith, ‘The Scripture is the pillar and foundation of our faith.’ *It is rashness to believe without the warrant or direction of the Scriptures. It is not devotion nor catholic faith, but foolish rashness.*”²

“When Paul came to Berea from Thessalonica, and

¹ Treatise of the Holy Scriptures, pp. 32—34, in his Works.

² Sermons, p. 173.

began there to preach the gospel of Christ, the people ran to their books, searched the Scriptures, conferred his doctrine with the word of God, and when they found that in all points it agreed therewith, then they believed Paul, then they embraced his doctrine, then with willing hearts they clave to his discipline. And *as they did, even so let us do, good brethren* ; let us not judge rashly of God's ministers, let us not over hastily give sentence of them ; let us not report evil of God's servants : but let us well weigh and consider what thing they teach us ; let us *examine and try their doctrine with the touchstone of God's word* ; let us confer their preaching, their teaching, *their discipline*, with the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost. And this when you have done, then *be you our judges* ; then if you see that we teach you nothing but the mysteries of God, if you perceive that we only disclose unto you the will of God, if you see that we preach unto you none other thing than the secrets of God's gospel, esteem us to be the servants of God, the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the secrets of God." ¹

" 'Try all things.' God hath given you the spirit of discretion and of judgment. Be wise, and know what is that good and acceptable will of God. Be not deceived with words of man's wisdom. . . . Thus are the people of God called to try the truth, to judge between good and ill, between light and darkness. God hath made them *the promise of his Spirit, and hath left unto them his word*. They of Berea, when they heard the preaching of Paul, searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so as he taught them, and many of them believed. So do you : give heed to instruction, and yet receive not all things without proof and trial, that they are not contrary to the wholesome doctrine of the word of God." ²

Such is the testimony of one who is put forward to us as maintaining the doctrine, " that the unanimous witness of Christendom is the only and the fully sufficient

¹ Sermons, p. 226.

² On 1 Thess. v. 21. p. 102.

and the really existing guarantee of the whole revealed faith; that Catholicity is the only test of truth.”¹

Of the Fathers he speaks thus;—

“ You know, right well, we despise not the authority of the holy Fathers, but rather, in this self-same place, have alleged together S. Augustine, S. Hierome, and S. Ambrose, three of the most antient and approved Fathers; and throughout the whole discourse of this Apology in the defence of the *Catholic truth of our religion*, next unto God’s holy word, have used no proof or authority so much as the expositions and judgments of the holy Fathers. We despise them not, therefore; but rather give God thanks in their behalf, for that it hath pleased him to provide so worthy instruments for his Church . . . To come near the matter, we say not that all cases of doubt are, by manifest and open words, plainly expressed in the Scriptures. For so there should need no exposition. But, we say, *there is no case in religion so dark and doubtful, but it may necessarily be either proved or reproved by collection and conference of the Scriptures.* . . . In this conference and judgment of the holy Scriptures, we need oftentimes the discretion and wisdom of learned Fathers. But, notwithstanding, may we not give them herein greater credit than is convenient; or than they themselves, if it were offered, would receive. We may reverently say of them, as Seneca in the like case sometime said, ‘*They are our leaders, but not our lords.*’ They are not the truth of God itself, but only witnesses unto the truth . . . St. Augustine saith, ‘*Solis canonicis Scripturis sine ulla recusatione consensum debeo.*’ ‘I owe my consent without gainsaying (not unto the doctors or fathers, but) only unto the canonical Scriptures.’ But the bishops in those Councils, saith M. Harding, brought forth and followed the expositions of the antient learned Fathers. And wherefore might they not? What man ever taught or said the contrary? Yet notwithstanding *they alleged them not as the foundations or grounds, but only as approved and faithful*

¹ Keble’s *Catena Patrum*, p. 2.

witnesses of the truth. St. Augustine in another case concerning the Arians . . . likewise refuseth the determinations of all Councils and Fathers, and standeth only to the Scriptures; Neither will I, saith he, allege against thee the Council of Nice; nor shalt thou allege against me the Council of Ariminum, &c. Neither doth S. Augustine only say thus; but also yieldeth a reason why he saith it. These be his words. ‘Have away all those authorities that either of us allegeth against the other; saving only such as be taken out of the heavenly canonical Scriptures. But perhaps some man will ask me, Wherefore would ye have all such other authorities put away? I answer, Because I would have the holy Church to be proved, not by the doctrines of men, but by the word of God.’ . . . *Fain would M. Harding have his reader believe* [so similar were his tactics to those of the Tractators] *that we utterly despise all holy Fathers.* But we despise them not, M. Harding, as may partly appear by that we have already said. We read their works, we reverence them, we give God thanks for them; we call them the pillars, the lights, the fathers of God’s Church; we despise them not. This thing only we say, Were their learning and holiness never so great, yet be they not equal in credit with the Scriptures of God. . . . As the Scriptures were written by the Spirit of God, so must they be *expounded by the same.* For without that Spirit we have neither ears to hear, nor eyes to see. It is that Spirit that openeth, and no man shutteth; the same shutteth, and no man openeth. The same Spirit prepared and opened the silkwoman’s heart, that she should give ear to and consider the things that were spoken by S. Paul. And in respect of this Spirit, the Prophet Esay saith, ‘They shall be all taught of God.’ But God hath not bound himself that this Spirit should evermore dwell in Rome, *but upon the lowly and humble-hearted that trembleth at the word of God.* . . . *Whereas we make reasonable request that God may be umpire in his own cause, and that all our controversies may be judged and tried by the*

*holy Scriptures, M. Harding thereto answereth thus, the Scripture standeth not in the words, but in the sense; and the same sense is continued by tradition in the Church. Otherwise he saith, the Jews, the Arians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, and all other heretics, were always able to claim by the Scriptures . . . Notwithstanding Pharisees and heretics wickedly misalleged the Scriptures, as ye sometimes do, to serve your purpose, yet for all that, Christ said unto them, 'Search the Scriptures.' And, as it is said before, the Catholic learned Fathers, in all their cases and controversies, appealed evermore to the Scriptures. . . . To conclude, WHEREAS M. HARDING SAITH, WE CANNOT UNDERSTAND THE SCRIPTURES WITHOUT TRADITION, [the very words of the Tractators] THE ANTIENT FATHER IRENÆUS SAITH, THIS IS ONE SPECIAL MARK WHEREBY WE MAY KNOW AN HERETIC."*¹

"But what say we of the Fathers, Augustine, Ambrose, Hierome, Cyprian, &c.? What shall we think of them; or what account may we make of them? They be interpreters of the word of God. They were learned men, and learned Fathers; the instruments of the mercy of God; and vessels full of grace. We despise them not, we read them, we reverence them, and give thanks unto God for them. They were witnesses unto the truth; they were worthy pillars and ornaments in the Church of God. Yet may they not be compared with the word of God. We may not *build upon them*; we may not make them the *foundation and warrant of our conscience*,—we may not put our trust in them. Our trust is in the name of the Lord. And thus are we taught to esteem of the learned Fathers of the Church, by their own judgment; by that which they have written, either for the credit of their own doings, or of the authority which they have thought due to the writings of others."²

"But they say, the Scriptures be dark, therefore we must seek *the meaning of them in the doctors*. THE DOCTORS

¹ Defence of Apology, pp. 53—69.

² Treat. of the Holy Script. p. 36.

AGREE NOT. Then must we weigh and try them by the Master of the Sentences. The Master of the Sentences himself sometimes is not holden. Then must we seek further to the school-doctors. The school-doctors can in no wise agree. There is Scotus against Thomas, and Occam against Scotus, and Alliacensis against Occam; the nominals against the reals, the scholastics against the canonists; the contention is greater, and the doubts darker, than ever they were before.”¹

“Saint Hierome (contra Luciferianos) saith, ‘Nomine unitatis et fidei infidelitas scripta est;’ ‘infidelity hath been written under the name of faith and unity.’ For herein they thought themselves good, and holy, and catholic, if they departed not from the unity of the world. Therefore they followed *the general consent of others*,—they thought themselves, saith he, the true Church, and seemed to follow unity; though, indeed, they fell to infidelity. ‘Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin;’ whatsoever it be, be it never so holy, never so glorious, it is sin; it displeaseth God; the end thereof is destruction. Therefore Christ saith, ‘I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.’ . . . *The will of the Lord is the only measure whereby all truth must be tried.* . . . Leave the pretence of zeal, leave the devotion of your own heart, rest not upon the will of your forefathers, nor of flesh and blood. Learn to feel and taste the will of God; it is good, and gracious, and merciful; thereby direct your steps, therein shall you find the possession of life.”²

And in defence of that passage in the Apology, in which he says, “Thus did the holy Fathers always fight against the heretics with none other force than with the holy Scriptures;” to which Harding (like the Tractators) objects that, in the early Councils, the points in dispute were determined by an appeal to the exposition of the holy Fathers, particularly at Nice, (our opponents’ fa-

¹ Reply to Harding’s Answer, p. 193.

² Sermons, pp. 212—13.

vourite reference); and that it was the heretics only who resorted to the sole authority of the Scriptures; Bishop Jewell remarks, "Touching the Arians, that they alleged certain doubtful and dark places of the Scriptures to serve their purpose, it is certain and manifest. But that either they despised, or that the Catholics against them avouched, the exposition and authority of any Father, M. Harding's only word must be our warrant. For neither allegeth he any one author for proof hereof; nor yet nameth any of all these Fathers. Notwithstanding, let us grant these heretics cried out, as M. Harding saith, Scriptures, Scriptures. Even so did the same heretics likewise cry out, even as now M. Harding doth, Fathers, Fathers . . . [and then adducing several instances of such appeals, he adds] . . . I doubt not, M. Harding, but you may hereby easily see that the heretics ye speak of, cried not only, Scriptures, Scriptures, as ye say, but had leisure, also, sometimes to cry, as you do, Fathers, Fathers. Touching this word *Homousius*, which M. Harding here moveth, and the whole contention of the Arians, Epiphanius writeth thus, 'This word, substance, plainly and nakedly, is not found, neither in the Old, nor in the New Testament; *but the sense and meaning of that word is found everywhere*. . . . Now let us see whether the bishops and others in these Councils confuted these heretics, as we say, by the Scriptures; or else, as M. Harding seemeth to say, *for want or weakness of the Scriptures used therein the authority of the Fathers* . . . [and then having adduced several passages to show that it was by the authority of the Scriptures only that such matters were decided, he adds,] But the bishops in those Councils, saith M. Harding, brought forth and followed the expositions of the antient learned Fathers. And wherefore might they not? What man ever taught or said the contrary? Yet notwithstanding they alleged them, *not as the foundations or grounds, but only as approved and faithful witnesses of the truth.*"¹

¹ Def. of Apol. pp. 54—56.

And again, in another part, he says, that the antient heretics, "in defence of their errors, avouched the judgment of all the old bishops and doctors that had been before them, and the general consent of the primitive and whole universal Church."¹

And before I conclude the extracts on this head, I would call the reader's attention to a passage touching the degree of authority due to the customs in force in the primitive Church, and beg him to observe how differently Bishop Jewell spoke of it, to what the Tractators do. The bishop's view clearly is, that all that is of divine authority and perpetual obligation, is to be found in the Scriptures; and that as to other rites and customs, even though they might claim an Apostle for their author, they were not binding upon the Church in all ages, but might vary with circumstances.

"Where ye grant," he says to Dr. Cole, "that ye of your side have varied, and do yet vary, from the customs of the primitive Church, I cannot but commend your plainness therein, in telling the truth. But where, then, is your antiquity become? . . . But ye say, further, that the examples of the apostles and doctors bind you not. . . . Ye conclude that it were an error to say we are bound, of necessity, to follow the use of the primitive Church. To make you a full and a clear answer hereunto, I must needs use this distinction. There were some orders in the primitive Church commanded by God; and some other were devised by men for the better training of the people. Such orders as were commanded by God, may not be changed in any case, only because God commanded them. For as God is everlasting, so is his word and commandment everlasting. Of the other side, such orders as have been devised by men, may be broken upon some good consideration, only because they were men that devised them; for as men themselves be mortal, so all their wisdoms and inventions be but mortal. As, that the communion should be used in the morning or at night;

¹ Ib. p. 509.

that women should come to the Church either covered or openfaced, wherein ye say S. Peter took order, that the ministers' goods should be all in common, or otherwise, &c. These, and other like, were things appointed and ordered by men, and therefore were never used in all places of one sort; but as they were brought in by men, so might they be dissolved and broken by men. In these things, I grant, the examples of the doctors *or apostles* bind us not. . . . But of the other part, I say that such things as God hath commanded precisely *by his word*, may never be broken *by any custom or consent*. And *such be the things that we now require at your hands* . . . The cup which ye have taken from the people is not a ceremony, but a part of the sacrament . . . Again, to pray in such a tongue as the people may understand, and thereby be edified, is not a ceremony to be changed at man's pleasure, but the commandment of God," &c.¹

Further, as it respects the *fourth* point, viz. the alleged *obscurity* of the Scriptures, and the consequent necessity of Church-tradition to interpret them, thus speaks Bishop Jewell.

"They say, the Scriptures are hard, and above the reach of the people. So said the Pelagian heretic, Julian, whom S. Augustine therefore reproveth But God himself, and the antient Fathers of the Church, said otherwise Some things in the Scriptures are hard; I deny it not. It is very expedient that somewhat should be covered to make us more diligent in reading, more desirous to understand, more fervent in prayer, more willing to ask the judgment of others, and to presume the less of our own judgment It is true which S. Peter hath said, some things are hard to be understood. But it is also true, that they which pervert them unto their own destruction, are unlearned and unstable; that is, they to whom they are hard, have not their eyes opened that they may see the light of the word; or they be wicked, and turn the truth of God into lies, and abuse the Scriptures to their own damnation. The owlet seeth not by the

¹ Ib. pp. 41, 2.

brightness of the sun ; not because the sunbeams are dark, but for that his eyes are weak, and cannot abide so clear light ; it is, therefore, but *a pretence and colour for their ignorance, and a means to deceive the people more boldly with their errors, when they charge the word of God with darkness and hardness* The ways of the Lord are straight, and his words plain, even unto the simple. Chrysostom saith, ‘ All things are clear and plain in the holy Scriptures ; whatsoever things there are necessary for us, are also manifest.’ Some things are covered, as men cover precious stones and precious garments. They are covered, and yet we see them. We see them, and yet they are covered. *Yet all things that are necessary, are plain and open* [and after quoting a passage from Theodoret, he adds] Thus we see there was a time, before ignorance crept into the Church, and got the upper hand, when the word of God was not counted hard, and dark, and doubtful ; when children, and women, and servants, and men of the country, had the knowledge of God, and were able to reason of the works of God. Then went it well with them ; they could not easily be deceived, because they had that word which bewrayeth the thief ; they carried with them, like good exchangers, the weights and touchstone ; and were able to try coins, whether they were true or false. Such were the people, such was the state of God’s Church in those days.”¹

“ We teach not the people to presume of knowledge, as you teach them to presume of ignorance. But only we exhort them, for the better satisfaction of their consciences, to read the Scriptures, *and therein to learn the goodwill of God . . .* But ye will say, the Scriptures are hard, and above the reach of the people. Even so said the Pelagian heretic, Julianus, and therefore S. Augustine thus reprovveth him for the same.”²

“ Whereas M. Harding, to withdraw the people’s hearts from reading, saith, the Scriptures are dark and

¹ Treat. of the Holy Script. pp. 43—46.

² Def. of Apol. pp. 516, 17.

dangerous, and no man able to wade in them without a guide, S. Chrysostom contrariwise, to encourage the people to read the Scriptures, saith they be plain and easy; and *that the ignorant and simple man, by prayer unto God, may attain the knowledge of them, without any master or teacher, by himself alone.*"¹

"Notwithstanding a few certain places in the holy Scriptures be obscure, yet generally 'the Scriptures are a candle to guide our feet;' generally, 'God's commandment is light, and lighteneth the eyes;' and therefore, generally, the word of God is full of comfort . . . [and then proceeding to quote from Chrysostom and others, he adds] Thus, notwithstanding certain clauses and sentences in the holy Scriptures be hard and dark, yet by these holy Fathers' judgments, *the Scriptures generally are easy and clear* . . . True it is, flesh and blood is not able to understand the holy will of God, without special revelation. Therefore Christ gave thanks unto his Father, 'For that he had revealed his secrets unto the little ones,' and likewise 'opened the hearts of his disciples, that they might understand the Scriptures.' Without this special help and prompting of God's holy Spirit, the word of God is unto the reader, be he never so wise, or well learned, as the vision of a sealed book. *But this revelation is not special unto one or two, but general to all them that be the members of Christ, and are endued with the Spirit of God.*"²

It is the written word, he tells us, that convicts heretics, and enables us to avoid heresies. "This word confounded the Arians, and all sorts of heretics."³ "In the primitive Church, and long after the Apostles' time, there were sundry sects and sorts of heresies . . . yet, that notwithstanding, the antient Fathers then evermore called upon the people, and exhorted them to read the Scriptures, to the intent they might the better avoid heresies. For Irenæus, writing against the heretics called Valen-

¹ Reply to Harding, p. 152.

² Reply to Harding, pp. 393, 4.

³ Treat. of the Holy Script. p. 33.

tiniani, saith thus, ‘ All this befel unto them, because they knew not the Scriptures.’ . . . Likewise, saith Theophylact, ‘ Nothing can deceive them that search the holy Scriptures; for that is the candle whereby the thief is espied.’ ”¹

And it convicts heretics, he says, in that very point in which our authors tell us we are indebted to tradition for the orthodox doctrine, as we have already seen in a quotation given above; and as he again states in the following, “ M. Harding saith, These express words, *Persona, Ingenitus, Homousios*, are not found in the Scriptures. So said the Arian heretics, too, as well as he; but what forceth that? Epiphanius saith, ‘ This very word *substantia*, is not plainly expressed, neither in the New, nor in the Old Testament; but the sense and meaning of that word is every where.’ ”²

In short, his views on this point may be at once known from the testimony already quoted above,—“ *To conclude, whereas M. Harding saith, we cannot understand the Scriptures without tradition; the antient Father, Irenæus, saith, this is one special mark whereby we may know an heretic.*”³

Lastly, as it respects the *fifth* point, that it is on the authority of Church-tradition that we must receive the Scriptures, the following testimony may suffice. “ Here M. Harding thinketh to oppress us with THE OLD HERETICS’ ORDINARY QUESTION, ‘ How know you, saith he, that the Scriptures be the Scriptures? How know you that the gospel of Thomas, Bartholomew and Nicodeme are no Scriptures?’ Thus they labour to pull all credit from the word of God, and send us only to their traditions . . . A man might well demand the like question of M. Harding. *How know you that the sun is the sun? or that the moon is the moon? or how know you that the Church is the Church; or that the congregation of the wicked is not the Church? Such idle questions the old heretics, the*

¹ Reply to Harding, p. 392.

² Def. of Apol. p. 203.

³ Def. of Apol. p. 69.

Manichees, demanded of S. Augustine. But S. Augustine answered them, ‘If you demand of us how we know that these be the Apostles’ writings, we make you this short answer; Even so we know that our writings are of the Apostles, as you know that your writings are of the heretic Manichee.’”¹

Such are the statements of the esteemed prelate who is appealed to by Mr. Keble, as a supporter of the Tractators’ doctrine of “tradition.”

But, in truth, the Tractators themselves have almost spared us the necessity of demonstrating their error and inconsistency in such appeals, by having themselves, at last, turned upon the very man to whom they here appeal as the supporter of this doctrine, as one altogether opposed to their whole system.

The first distinct intimation of the light in which the Tractators view our Reformers, was given in Mr. Froude’s *Remains*, (edited by Mr. Newman,) whose wholesale abuse of the Reformers, especially Jewell, having somewhat startled the Church, some feeble excuses were hinted on the ground of his being but an individual, and one accustomed to speak with freedom and vehemence. But as the Tractators’ doctrine gained ground, and the impression made upon the public mind was deepened, it seems to have been supposed that an advance might be made, and “the worthiest divine that Christendom had bred for the space of some hundreds of years,” as the “judicious” Hooker called him, fairly thrown overboard. Accordingly, in a late Number of the *British Critic*, (published during the progress of this work through the press) we have an article whose express “object” it is “to justify the substance of those disparaging remarks.”²

In this article, it is said of Jewell;—“Bishop Jewell contrives, with the help of the Fathers, to reduce to atoms nearly the whole stately and well-proportioned fabric of Catholicism.”³

¹ Def. of the Apol. p. 204.

² Brit. Crit. for July, 1841, p. 8.

³ Ib. p. 6.

"Without going into the question, whether Roman Catholicism is not at least better than such Protestantism as Bishop Jewell's."¹

The Articles of the Church of England "were certainly framed by persons of a thoroughly uncatholic spirit."²

"Ours is the humbler, as well as less pleasant task, of assailing the credit of the most active of the Elizabethan Reformers."³

"Archbishop Parker tried to force it [i. e. *Jewell's Apology*,] and the *still more objectionable* 'Defence,' almost as a quasi-formulary upon the Church of England."⁴

Now this last remark, be it remembered, is made respecting a work which Collier, the Nonjuror, tells us was "set forth with the consent of the bishops;" which, according to Bishop Randolph, "was always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church, in whose name it is written;" which is quoted by Hooker as "The English Apology," and is recognized in Canon 30 of the Canons of 1603, as "The Apology of the Church of England."⁵

How are we to account for such extraordinary inconsistency? Can it be satisfactorily explained? To say the least, what confidence can be placed in the guidance of such teachers?

From Jewell let us pass on to "the judicious"

HOOKE.

The passage which Mr. Keble has quoted from him, is taken from his Ecclesiastical Polity, bk. 3. ch. 1. In what way it bears upon the subject, I am quite at a loss to conjecture; and, therefore, as the work is in every one's hands, it is unnecessary to do more than refer the reader to it.

But has Hooker only spoken thus indistinctly on this subject? Let us inquire.

¹ Brit. Crit. for July, 1841. p. 13.

² Ib. p. 27.

³ Ib. p. 32.

⁴ Ib. p. 37.

⁵ See p. 598 above.

As it respects the *first* point, then, as to tradition being a divine informant, his testimony is as follows;—

“When the question, therefore, is whether we be now to seek for *any revealed law of God, otherwise than only in the Sacred Scripture*; whether we do now stand bound in the sight of God to yield to *traditions*, urged by the Church of Rome, the same obedience and reverence we do to his *written* law, honouring equally, and adoring both as divine; *our answer is, no*. They that so earnestly plead for the authority of TRADITION, [observe, *not* Romish traditions in particular, but *tradition*,] as if nothing were more safely conveyed, than that which spreadeth itself by report, and descendeth by relation of former generations unto the ages that succeed, *are not* all of them—surely a miracle it were, if they should be—so simple as thus to persuade themselves*; howsoever, if the simple were so persuaded, they could be content, perhaps, very well to enjoy the benefit, as they account it, of that common error. *What hazard the truth is in when it passeth through the hands of report, how maimed and deformed it becometh, they are not, they cannot possibly be ignorant*. Let them that are indeed of this mind, consider but only that little of things divine, which the heathen have in such sort received. How miserable had the state of the Church of God been, long ere this, if wanting the sacred Scriptures, we had no record of his laws, but only the memory of man receiving the same by report and relation from his predecessors?”¹

And hence, in another place, he says,—“They which add traditions as a part of supernatural necessary truth, have not the truth, but are in error. For they only plead that whatsoever God revealeth as necessary for all Christian men to *do or believe*, the same we ought to embrace, whether we have received it by writing, or otherwise; *which no man denieth*: when that which they should confirm, who claim so great reverence unto TRADITIONS, is, that the same traditions are necessarily to be acknow-

¹ E. P. bk. 1. ch. 13.

ledged divine and holy. For we do not reject them only because they are not in the Scripture, but *because they are neither in Scripture, nor can otherwise sufficiently, by any reason, be proved to be of God.* That which is of God, and may be evidently proved to be so, we deny not but it hath in his kind, although unwritten, yet the self-same force and authority with the written laws of God.”¹ Here, again, he speaks not of *Romish* traditions in particular, but of traditions *generally*, and affirms that they cannot be proved to be of God. How we are to account for Mr. Newman’s perversion of this passage (Lect. xi. p. 334) I am quite at a loss to understand. And so, in another place, he speaks of “*uncertain tradition.*”²

Hence, when he comes to speak of the sign of the cross in baptism, he says, “We observe it not as the ordinance of God, but of *man*. For, saith Tertullian, ‘if of this, and the like customs, thou shouldest require some commandment to be showed thee *out of Scriptures*, there is none found;’”³ clearly showing that Hooker considered it only an ordinance of man, not of God, *because* it could not be “showed out of Scriptures.”

And having thus altogether rejected the notion of the divine or apostolical origin of “tradition,” in matters both of faith and practice, when he has occasion afterwards to mention “tradition” as “justifying” the use of the cross in baptism, he adds,—“Lest, therefore, the name of tradition should be offensive to any, considering how far by some it hath been, and is abused, *we mean by traditions, ordinances made in the prime of Christian religion, established with that authority which Christ hath left to his Church for matters indifferent*; and in that consideration requisite to be observed, *till like authority see just and reasonable cause to alter them.* So that *traditions ecclesiastical* are not rudely and in gross to be shaken off, because *the inventors of them were men.*”⁴

He discards, therefore, even the use of the word “tradi-

¹ Bk. 1. ch. 14.

² Bk. v. ch. 65.

³ Bk. 2. ch. 8. See p. 656 above.

⁴ Bk. 5. ch. 65.

tions," except in the sense of ordinances made at an early period by the Church; and these he holds to be at any time alterable by the Church.

Let us proceed to the *second* and *third* points.

First, as to the *necessary* points of faith and practice.

"Neither," says Hooker, "*can I find that men of soundest judgment have any otherwise taught than that articles of belief and things which all men must, of necessity, do, to the end they may be saved, are either expressly set down in Scripture, or else plainly thereby to be gathered.*"¹

And these testimonies are the more weighty, because Hooker's opponents disregarded and despised everything but Scripture, even in minute points of discipline; so that Hooker's argument rather led him to show what Scripture was not fitted for, than how complete it was. Bearing this in mind, let us observe how, in the following passage, this "judicious" writer holds the mean between Popenry and Puritanism.

"An earnest desire to draw *all things* unto the determination of bare and naked Scripture, [for the proposition of the early nonconformists, which Hooker in this place undertakes to controvert, was, "that Scripture is the only rule of *all things which in this life may be done by men,*"] hath caused here much pains to be taken in abating the estimation and credit of man. Which if we labour to maintain *as far as truth and reason will bear*, let not any think that we travel about a matter not greatly needful. For the scope of all their pleading against *man's authority* is, to overthrow such *orders, laws, and constitutions* in the Church, as *depending thereupon*, if they should therefore be taken away, would peradventure leave neither face nor memory of Church to continue long in the world, the world especially being such as now it is. . . . Wherefore, to say that simply an argument taken from man's authority doth hold no way, 'neither affirmatively nor negatively,' is hard. By a man's authority we here understand the force which his

¹ Bk. 3. ch. 10.

word hath for the assurance of another's mind that buildeth upon it. . . . And if it be admitted that in matter of fact there is some credit to be given to the testimony of man, but not in matter of opinion and judgment, we see the contrary both acknowledged and universally practised also throughout the world. The sentences of wise and expert men were never but *highly esteemed*. . . . Utterly to infringe the force and strength of man's testimony, were to shake the very fortress of God's truth. For whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by Christ, although the Scripture be therein the ground of our belief, yet the authority of man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scripture. The Scripture could not teach us the things that are of God, unless we did credit men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signify those things.¹ Some way, therefore, notwithstanding man's infirmity, yet his authority may enforce assent. Upon better advice and deliberation so much is perceived and at the length confest, that arguments taken from the authority of men may not only so far forth as hath been declared, but further also be of some force in 'human sciences;' which force, be it never so small, doth shew that they are not *utterly naught*. But in 'matters divine' it is still maintained stiffly that they have no manner force at all. Howbeit, the very selfsame reason which causeth to yield that they are of some force in the one, will at the length constrain also to acknowledge that they are not in the other *altogether unforcible*. . . . Whom God hath endued with principal gifts to aspire unto knowledge by; whose exercises, labours, and divine studies, he hath so blessed, that the world, for their great and rare skill that way, hath them in singular admira-

¹ This sentence explains the preceding, which has been quoted in a sense never intended by Hooker. "His sense," as Bishop Stillingfleet says, "is plain and obvious, viz. that men cannot come to the natural sense and importance of the *words* used in Scripture, unless they rely on the authority of men for the *signification* of those *words*." (Grounds of Prot. Rel. ch. 7. sub fin.)

tion, may we reject even their judgment likewise as being *utterly of no moment*? For mine own part I dare not so lightly esteem of the Church and of the principal pillars therein. *I grant that proof derived from the authority of man's judgment is not able to work that assurance which doth grow by a stronger proof; and, therefore,* ALTHOUGH TEN THOUSAND GENERAL COUNCILS WOULD SET DOWN ONE AND THE SAME DEFINITIVE SENTENCE CONCERNING ANY POINT OF RELIGION WHATSOEVER, YET ONE DEMONSTRATIVE REASON ALLEGED, OR ONE MANIFEST TESTIMONY CITED FROM THE MOUTH OF GOD HIMSELF TO THE CONTRARY, COULD NOT CHOOSE BUT OVERWEIGH THEM ALL; INASMUCH AS FOR THEM TO HAVE BEEN DECEIVED, IT IS NOT IMPOSSIBLE; IT IS, THAT DEMONSTRATIVE REASON OR TESTIMONY DIVINE SHOULD DECEIVE. Howbeit in *defect of proof infallible*, because the mind doth rather follow *probable persuasions* than approve the things that have in them no likelihood of truth at all, surely if a question concerning matter of doctrine were proposed, and on the one side *no kind of proof appearing*, there should on the other be alleged and shewed that so *a number of the learnedest divines in the world have ever thought*, although it did not appear what reason or what Scripture led them to be of that judgment, yet to their very bare judgment *somewhat* a reasonable man would attribute, notwithstanding the common imbecilities which are incident into our nature. And whereas it is thought that especially with 'the Church, and those that are called and persuaded of the authority of the word of God, man's authority,' with them especially, 'should not prevail,' it must and doth prevail even with them, yea with them especially, *as far as equity requireth, and farther we maintain it not*.
 . . . Concerning the verdict of Jerome, if no man, be he never so well learned, have, after the Apostles, any authority to publish new doctrine as from heaven, and to require the world's assent as unto truth received by prophetic revelation, doth this prejudice the credit of learned men's judgments in opening that truth *which by*

being conversant in the Apostles' writings they have themselves from thence [observe "from thence"] learned? . . . We cannot, therefore, be persuaded that the will of God is, we should so far reject the authority of men as to reckon it NOTHING." (bk. 2. ch. 7.) In these judicious observations there are few, comparatively, I suppose, who will not heartily concur.

There is one passage, however, in this chapter, which, as it is particularly forcible in exposing an important error of our opponents connected with this point, and is independent of the context, I have reserved to notice by itself. The Tractators stoutly maintain, that the great points in dispute in the primitive Church were decided by the orthodox Fathers by a reference to *tradition*; and that in this the orthodox were distinguished from heretics, who appealed only to Scripture. Now, one of the arguments of the disputant (Cartwright) with whom Hooker was more particularly contending, was that the Fathers on those occasions appealed only to Scripture to *decide*, and that therefore they held human authority as of *no value*. How, then, does Hooker meet this statement? Does he take the view maintained by the Tractators, and deny his opponents' premises as to the Fathers' appeals to Scripture? Precisely the contrary. He adopts and strongly maintains his opponent's *premises*, but justly denies his conclusion. "*In that antient strife*," he says, "*which was between the Catholic Fathers and Arians, Donatists, and others of like perverse and froward disposition, as long as to Fathers or Councils alleged on the one side the like by the contrary side were opposed, IMPOSSIBLE it was that ever the question should by THIS MEANS grow unto any issue or end. The Scripture they both believed; THE SCRIPTURE they knew could not give sentence ON BOTH SIDES; by Scripture the controversy between them was such as might be determined. In this case WHAT MADNESS was it with such kinds of proofs to NOURISH THEIR CONTENTION, when there were such EFFECTUAL MEANS to end all controversy that was between them!*" Here, then, in the very

strongest terms he could use, he constitutes Scripture the Judge of these controversies. But he justly concludes, against the hasty and unauthorized inference of his opponent from the facts here allowed, "Hereby, therefore, it doth not as yet appear that an argument of authority of man affirmatively is in matters divine *NOTHING worth*."¹

Again; "They which rightly consider after what sort the heart of man hereunto is framed, must of necessity acknowledge, that whoso assenteth to the words of eternal life doth it in regard of *his authority* whose words they are."²

Further; let the reader weigh well the following passage, recollecting that the system under review is based upon the supposition that primitive Church-tradition was derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles. "Furthermore, having received Apostolic doctrine, [i. e. in the *Scriptures*, for it is of reading the *Scriptures* that he is speaking,] the Apostle St. Paul hath taught us to esteem the same as *the supreme rule whereby all other doctrines* [using the word in its *proper* sense as meaning *teachings*] *must for ever be examined*. (Gal. i. 8, 9.) Yea, but inasmuch as the Apostle doth there speak of that he had preached, he flatly maketh—as they strangely affirm—his Preachings or Sermons the rule whereby to examine all. And then, I beseech you, what rule have we whereby to judge or examine any? [Why, the Tractators would reply, we have the rule of primitive Church-tradition, which delivers down to us the substance of the "preachings" of the Apostles, which is part of our rule of faith; but not so thought Hooker, for he adds] For if sermons must be our rule, because the Apostles' sermons were so to their hearers; then, sith we are not, as they were, hearers of the Apostles' sermons, it resteth that either the sermons which we hear should be our rule, or, that being absurd, there will, which yet hath greater absurdity, *NO RULE AT ALL BE REMAINING FOR TRIAL* what doctrines now are corrupt, what consonant

¹ Bk. ii. ch. 7.

² Bk. v. ch. 22.

with heavenly truth.”¹ In this passage, though not directly on the subject, Hooker’s mind respecting it is clearly, though incidentally, disclosed.

Again; “When we read or recite the Scripture, we then deliver to the people properly the word of God. As for our sermons . . . his word is commonly the subject whereof they treat, and *must be the rule whereby they are framed.*” Yes; notwithstanding the misunderstood canon of 1571, the written word of God must be *THE RULE whereby our sermons are framed.*²

Again; “Exclude the use of natural reasoning about the sense of Holy Scripture concerning the Articles of our faith, and then that the Scripture doth concern the Articles of our faith who can assure us? That which by right exposition buildeth up Christian faith, being misconstrued, breedeth error; *between true and false construction the difference reason must shew.*”³

Further, as it respects the notion that primitive Church-tradition delivers to us several *important* divinely revealed truths *not in Scripture*, we have the following testimonies. “Whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by Christ,” “the Scripture” is “therein the ground of our belief.”⁴ “One thing especially we must observe, namely, that the *absolute perfection* of Scripture is seen by relation unto that end whereto it tendeth. And even hereby it cometh to pass, that first such as imagine the general and main drift of the body of sacred Scripture not to be so large as it is, nor that God did thereby intend to deliver, *as in truth he doth, a full instruction* in all things unto salvation necessary, the knowledge whereof man by nature could not otherwise in this life attain unto; they are by this very mean induced either still to look for new revelations from heaven, or else dangerously to add to the word of God *uncertain tradition*, that so the doctrine of man’s salvation may be complete; which doctrine we constantly hold *in all respects without any such thing added to be so complete, that* WE UTTERLY REFUSE AS MUCH AS

¹ Bk. v. ch. 22.

² Bk. v. ch. 22.

³ Bk. iii. ch. 8.

⁴ Bk. ii. ch. 7.

ONCE TO ACQUAINT OURSELVES WITH ANYTHING FURTHER. Whatsoever to make up the doctrine of man's salvation is added, as in supply of the Scripture's unsufficiency, we reject it. *Scripture purposing this hath perfectly and fully done it.*"¹

This last passage *may* certainly be interpreted, or rather explained away, as if it referred *only* to things *necessary* to salvation; but it appears to me clearly to include more. I leave the reader to judge. But we have still more decisive testimonies.

"He that readeth unto us the Scriptures," he says elsewhere, "delivereth *ALL the mysteries of faith.*"²

"To urge anything upon the Church requiring thereunto that religious assent of Christian belief wherewith the words of the holy prophets are received; to urge anything as part of that supernatural and celestially revealed truth which God hath taught, and not to shew it in Scripture; this did the antient Fathers evermore think *UNLAWFUL, IMPIOUS, EXECRABLE.*"³

And that his views on this point include matters of practice as well as matters of faith, that is, that none can be considered as certainly of divine or apostolical origin, but those that are in the Scriptures, is fully proved by the extracts already given in a previous page.⁴

On the *fourth* point, alleging the *obscurity* of Scripture, and the consequent *necessity* of the traditional interpretation for understanding it, he bears this witness;—

"There is in Scripture, therefore, *no defect*, but that any man, what place or calling soever he hold in the Church of God, may have thereby the light of his natural understanding so perfected, that the one being relieved by the other, there can want *no part of needful instruction unto any good work which God himself requireth*, be it natural or supernatural, belonging simply unto men as men, or unto men as they are united in whatsoever kind of society. It sufficeth, therefore, that *nature and Scripture* do serve in such full sort, that they both jointly, and

¹ Bk. ii. ch. 8. ² Bk. v. ch. 22. ³ Bk. ii. ch. 5. ⁴ See p. 650 above.

not severally either of them, be so complete, that unto everlasting felicity *we need not the knowledge of anything more than these two may easily furnish our minds with on all sides.*"¹

"The unsufficiency of the light of nature is, by the light of Scripture, so fully and so perfectly herein supplied, that further light than this hath added there doth not need unto that end [i. e. "that we may attain unto life everlasting"]."²

"We maintain that, in Scripture, we are *taught* all things necessary unto salvation;"³ and a little further on, he adds that, in interpreting Scripture, "between true and false construction, the difference reason must shew."

Again; "I would know, by some special instance, what one *article of Christian faith*, or what *duty* required necessarily unto all men's salvation there is, which *the very reading of the word of God* is not *apt to notify*. Effects are miraculous and strange, when they grow by unlikely means. But did we ever hear it accounted for a wonder, that he which doth read should believe, and live according to the will of Almighty God? (Exod. xxiv. 7.) *Reading doth convey to the mind that truth, without addition or diminution, which Scripture hath derived from the Holy Ghost.* And the end of all Scripture is the same which St. John proposeth in the writing of that most divine Gospel, namely, *faith; and through faith, salvation.* (John xx. 21.) Yea, all Scripture is to this effect in itself available, as they which wrote it were persuaded. (Prov. i. 2—4. Rom. i. 16. 2 Tim. iii. 15.); *unless we suppose that the Evangelist, or others, in speaking of their own intent to instruct, and to SAVE BY WRITING, had a secret conceit which they never opened unto any; a conceit, that no man in the world should ever be that way the better for any sentence by them written, till such time as the same might chance to be preached upon, or alleged at the least in a sermon,* [or, to give another instance, fully included in

¹ Bk. i. ch. 14.² Bk. ii. ch. 8.³ Bk. iii. ch. 8.

Hooker's argument, *explained by Church-tradition*]. Otherwise, if he which writeth, do that which is *forcible in itself*, how should he which readeth, be thought to do that which, in itself, is of no force to *work belief*, and to *save believers*?"¹

Again, even still more clearly and pointedly. "Touching *hardness*, which is the second *pretended* impediment, as against homilies being plain and popular instructions it is no bar, so *neither doth it infringe the efficacy, no not of Scriptures although but read*. The force of reading, how small soever they would have it, must, of necessity, be granted sufficient to *notify that which is plain or easy to be understood*. And of things necessary to all men's salvation, we have been hitherto accustomed to hold, (especially sithence the publishing of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, *whereby the simplest having now a key unto knowledge*, which the Eunuch in the Acts (Acts viii. 31) did want, OUR CHILDREN MAY OF THEMSELVES, BY READING, UNDERSTAND THAT WHICH HE, WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER, COULD NOT,) they are in Scripture PLAIN AND EASY TO BE UNDERSTOOD. As for those things which at the first are obscure and dark, when memory hath laid them up for a time, judgment afterwards growing explaineth them. Scripture, therefore, is not so hard, but that THE ONLY READING THEREOF MAY GIVE LIFE UNTO WILLING HEARERS Surely if we perish, it is not the lack of scribes and learned expounders that can be our just excuse. *The word which saveth our souls is near us: WE NEED FOR KNOWLEDGE BUT TO READ AND LIVE*. (Rev. i. 3.)"²

Lastly, as it respects the *fifth* point, as to the authority on which we receive the Scriptures as the word of God, respecting which Archbishop Laud³ and Bishop Stillingfleet⁴ have long ago vindicated the Protestant orthodoxy of Hooker against the misrepresentation of the adherents of Tradition, he speaks thus;—

¹ Bk. v. ch. 22.

² Bk. v. ch. 22.

³ Conference with Fisher, § 16. No. 26.

⁴ Grounds of Protestant Religion, Pt. 1. c. 7. sub fin.

“Scripture, indeed, teacheth things above nature; things which our reason, by itself, could not reach unto. Yet those things, also, we believe; *knowing, by reason, that the Scripture is the word of God.* What with him [i. e. Agrippa] did authorize the Prophets, the like with us doth cause the rest of the Scripture of God to be of credit Scripture teacheth us that saving truth which God hath discovered unto the world by revelation; and it presumeth us taught otherwise that itself is divine and sacred. The question, then, being, by what means we are taught this; *some answer that to learn it, we have no other way than only tradition*, as namely, that so we believe, because both we from our predecessors, and they from theirs, have so received. BUT IS THIS ENOUGH? That which all men’s experience teacheth them, may not in anywise be denied. And by experience we all know, that *the first outward motive*, leading men so to esteem of the Scripture, is the authority of God’s Church. For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it, even at the first, an impudent thing for any man bred and brought up in the Church to be of a contrary mind, without cause. Afterwards the more we bestow our labour in reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it. So that *the former inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministered farther reason.*”¹ Upon which passage Archbishop Laud observes, “Here then, again, in his [i. e. Hooker’s] judgment, *tradition is the first inducement*; but the *farther reason and ground* is the Scripture. And *resolution of faith* ever settles upon the *farthest reason* it can; not upon the *first inducement.*” And Bishop Stillingfleet,—“Can anything be more plain, if men’s meaning may be gathered from their words, especially when purposely they treat of a subject, than that Hooker makes the authority of the Church the primary inducement to

¹ Bk. iii. ch. 8.

faith, and *that rational evidence which discovers itself in the doctrine revealed, to be that which it is finally resolved into?*" And, moreover, we may add, he distinctly intimates to us that tradition is not enough to assure us that Scripture is the word of God.

It will throw further light upon his views, however, if we add the context following the passage given above. "If infidels or atheists," he says, "chance at any time to call it in question, this giveth us occasion to *sift what reason there is*, whereby the testimony of the Church concerning Scripture, and our own *persuasion, which Scripture itself hath confirmed*, may be proved a truth infallible. In which case the antient Fathers, being often constrained to shew what warrant they had so much to rely upon the Scriptures, endeavoured still to maintain the authority of the books of God by arguments, such as unbelievers themselves must needs think reasonable, if they judged thereof as they should. Neither is it a thing impossible or greatly hard, even by such kind of proofs, *so to manifest and clear that point, that no man living shall be able to deny it, without denying some apparent principle, such as all men acknowledge to be true.*"¹

By these passages, therefore, we may see clearly the meaning of Hooker in the following. "Finally, we all believe that the Scriptures of God are sacred, and that they have proceeded from God; ourselves we assure that we do right well in so believing. We have, for this point, a demonstration sound and infallible. But it is not the word of God which doth, or possibly can assure us, that we do well to think it his word. For if any one book of Scripture did give testimony to all, yet still that Scripture which giveth credit to the rest, would require another Scripture to give credit unto it; neither could we ever come unto any pause whereon to rest our assurance this way; so that unless *BESIDE Scripture* there were something which might assure us that we do well, we could not think we do well, no not in being assured that

¹ Bk. iii. ch. 8.

Scripture is a sacred and holy rule of well-doing.”¹ This passage, when compared with the preceding, presents no difficulty; as is shown, both by Archbishop Laud and Bishop Stillingfleet.

In the same guarded and judicious way does Hooker speak on this point, in another place. “The voice and testimony of the Church,” he says, “acknowledging Scripture to be the law of the living God, is, for the truth and certainty thereof, *no mean evidence*. For if, with reason, we may presume upon things which a few men’s depositions do testify, suppose we that the minds of men are not, both at their first access to the school of Christ, *exceedingly moved*, yea, and for ever afterwards, also *confirmed much*, when they consider the main consent of all the Churches in the whole world witnessing the sacred authority of Scriptures, ever sithence the first publication thereof even till this present day and hour?”² Doubtless, it is an argument of great power, and a testimony which, in its place, and to a certain extent, is necessary.

Such is the testimony of “the judicious” Hooker respecting the system under review. And I suppose, indeed, it needs but few arguments to show that, however much the Tractators may have endeavoured, in the first instance, to avail themselves of Hooker’s great name, he who held Bishop Jewell to be the worthiest divine that Christendom had produced for centuries, and they who hold such language respecting the same prelate as the Tractators *now* do, cannot have much agreement with one another on such matters.

BISHOP MORTON.

The passage given by Mr. Keble from Bishop Morton, extracted from his will, amounts to little more than a statement of the *identity* of *his* creed with that of the Three Creeds, and the first four General Councils; and is just one of those passages of doubtful meaning, from the quotation of which Mr. Keble has obtained some ap-

¹ Bk. ii. ch. 4.

² Bk. v. ch. 22.

parent, and but apparent, support for his cause. I will give him another passage from the same author still stronger, but by no means supporting his views; as will clearly be seen, when we come to consider its terms, especially when viewing it in its connexion with other passages which I shall afterwards adduce.

"It hath been," he says, "the common and constant profession of all Protestants to stand unto the judgment of antiquity for the continuance of the first four hundred years, and more, in all things; which appeareth by their undoubted books and testimonies, clearly and universally held in those purest times for necessary doctrines of faith."¹

Now the very fact that he quotes "*all Protestants*" as agreeing in this, goes some way to prove that it is not equivalent to what our opponents maintain; for I suppose they themselves would not claim "*all the Protestants*," even of Bishop Morton's day, as on their side. No; it amounts to nothing more than this, that the Protestants, conscious that they had, upon the whole, the support of antiquity, and that the Romanists had not, openly avowed their willingness to be judged by that standard. Such an *appeal* to the testimony of antiquity, was the great subject of this work of Bishop Morton. But even there, he speaks so as to show that the system under review is altogether opposed to his sentiments.

For the *first three* points, I would beg the reader's attention to the following passages.

"That which directeth and ordereth man's soul unto God, and to eternity, is his faith; and the subject matter of faith is a truth revealed by the mouth of God, who only knoweth the way unto himself. Which, because these Apologists have appropriated unto their Romish party, wisdom would require that, seeing they undertake to manifest this by certain evidence of antiquity, they should insist especially in that manner of revelation which Christ, the Antient of days, the high and œcumenical

¹ Catholic Appeal, lib. ii. c. 29, § 5. p. 354.

Bishop, and the immediate converter of souls, hath commended unto his Church, to wit, *the oracles of the sacred Scriptures*; wherein, according to the common consent of antient Fathers, all necessary principles of faith and precepts of life, are *fully* registered. But they endeavour rather to derive a *confirmation of their profession from the testimonies of succeeding Fathers*; not so much presuming thereby, as may be thought, to evince a *demonstration of their religion*, as to draw us from the written word, the anchor-hold of faith, whereby all men who have given up their souls unto Christ, must be judged in the day of the Lord. NOTWITHSTANDING we willingly answer this their challenge, and directly proceed in our '*Appeal*' against their '*Apology*.'"¹ That is, notwithstanding we do not agree with them in thinking it necessary to go to "the testimonies of succeeding Fathers" for "a confirmation of our profession," when we have "the oracles of the sacred Scriptures," we yet "willingly answer their challenge," knowing that we have antiquity with us.

Again; "Our adversaries, by such their sinister handling of the writings of antient Fathers, and wresting of divine Scriptures for erecting a new article of faith, do give us just cause to suspect their profession herein, and IN ALL DOCTRINES OF FAITH, TO ADHERE PRECISELY TO THE WRITTEN WORD, AS UNTO THE SUFFICIENT AND INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH."²

"Such is the partial practice of our adversaries in condemning Protestants of impudence for refusing the testimonies, although but of a few; and yet will he have it held a point of learning and wisdom in themselves to reject, as often as they list, almost all; *which their opposition unto Fathers might seem more tolerable*, if herein they did not also cross and thwart the express and plain direction of the Spirit of God in the word."³

The antient Fathers, with common consent, do profess and adore the sufficiency of Scripture in all doctrines

¹ Lib. i. c. 1. § 1. p. 1.

² Lib. i. c. 2. § 15. p. 18.

³ Lib. ii. c. 1. § 4. p. 89.

necessarily belonging unto points of faith, or precepts of life.”¹

“*What good is it that is required unto an avrapkeia, and full sufficiency in any law, which issueth not abundantly from this sacred fountain of the written word?*”²

“We have heard of the confessed uncertainties of many traditional points, of the infallibility of the written word unto all believers, from the Fathers, so magnifying the *sufficiency* of the same word in all necessary doctrine, as ‘without which nothing may be spoken,’ (Theod. and Gregory,) ‘nothing delivered,’ (Damasc.) without which there is ‘no necessary tradition,’ (Cyprian,) no true ‘wisdom,’ (August.) ‘no faith,’ (Jer. and Orig.) *without which ‘who shall speak,’* (Ambr.) and ‘*woe to them that shall speak,*’ (Tertull.) without which it is a ‘sign of infidelity,’ (Basil.) ‘and of a devilish spirit to speak,’ (Theoph.); because the Scripture is a ‘door against thieves,’ (Chrysost.) ‘the true balances against all false,’ (August.) the ‘foundation and pillar of faith,’ (Jer.) the ‘most exact canon and rule of truth,’ (Chrys.) the ‘anchorhold of belief,’ (Athanas.). *And that therefore our consent must be only from Scriptures* (August.), THAT HERETICS MUST BE COMPELLED TO STAND ONLY UNTO SCRIPTURES (Tertull.), *that he is an anathema,* (Hilar.) *whosoever desireth not that the faith may be tried only by Scriptures,* (Athanas.) *because they are in themselves sufficient for our instruction.* (Cyril and others.) . . . Wherefore we appeal unto the conscience of every Christian to judge whether it do not deeply concern him to adore the *sufficiency* of sacred Scripture *as the treasure of all truth, the chair of Christ, and highest tribunal of souls upon earth;* and whether they who, in their cloven mitres, do profess the understanding and preaching of the doctrine of the two written Testaments, could justly refuse that condition which Protestants required of them in the Council of Trent, viz., that ‘*the Scriptures only* might be allowed for *the rule of deciding* of all doctrines necessary for salvation,’ or whether they might justly call this condition

¹ Lib. ii. c. 25. § 11. p. 326.

² Lib. ii. c. 25. § 13. p. 330.

unjust; or rather, whether this refusal be not, in truth, strongly prejudicial against their profession.”¹

“The Romanists are very large in their protestations in this behalf, [i. e. “of consenting unto the Fathers’ expositions,”] saying, ‘When either all, or almost all antient Fathers consent in one opinion, or else in the interpretation of any one place of Scripture, they may not be impugned;’ or thus, ‘When the greater part of Fathers do agree in one judgment, we profess this to be a Catholic truth.’ And the Bull of Pope Pius the Fourth, in the confirmation of the Council of Trent, prescribeth an oath unto all ‘Bishops, Deans, Canons, and all that have cure of souls, together with all that enjoy any places in monasteries, convents, or houses, and to whatsoever person regular,’ to swear ‘never to receive or use any interpretation of Scripture, which is not according to the uniform consent of antient Fathers.’ Never did the antient Jews more boast of their original and descent from Father Abraham, than do the Romanists glory in their pretended consent of antient Fathers; yet, as the ostentation of the former was condemned of Christ as carnal, so this latter may be justly condemned as sophistical. For they affirm that ‘the Fathers are to be accounted as doctors, not as judges, *not necessarily to be obeyed, but to be followed, so far as reason shall persuade.*’ THIS MIGHT SEEM REASONABLE, if they had not bound themselves, by oath, to follow their ‘uniform assent;’ for where there is a necessity of duty challenging the assent, there is no place left for liberty of ‘persuasion by reason.’”²

“To conclude, we find not *any tradition absolutely unwritten, (whether doctrinal or ceremonial,)* delivered by the Fathers, to be of that nature, as that it ought to be embraced, (this is the Romish profession,) with the like godly affection and reverence, as we do the sacred Scriptures. This we hold to be, in divinity, more than a paradox.”³ But, of course, if he had supposed that there were

¹ Lib. ii. c. 25. § 14. p. 332.

² Lib. 2. c. 29. § 1. pp. 347, 8.

³ Lib. ii. c. 25. § 8. p. 323.

any such traditions entitled to be received as “precious Apostolical relics,” this is an observation he could not have made.

And so a little further on, having noticed various ceremonial ordinances claiming to be considered Apostolical traditions, he speaks of “the uncertainty of such like traditions.”¹

And noticing the profession of the Romish clergy to interpret Scripture only according to the “uniform consent of antient Fathers,” (which is so fully adopted by the Tractators, as that they make that consent part of the rule of faith,) he says, “*which they neither can, nor do perform;*” adding, in the margin, “For what one of a thousand doth read all the Fathers, to try their consent in all interpretations?”²

On the *fourth* point, as to the *obscurity* of Scripture, the following may suffice.

“This displayeth the now Romish inhibition to be but indeed a pernicious innovation; whereby Rome, of a mother, is become a stepdame; dehorting her people from the reading of Scripture, because, forsooth, of the marvellous ‘*obscurities*’ thereof. Which argument doth fight against the conscience, first, of their own Jesuit Acosta, who saith, that ‘our gracious God hath marvellously provided in holy writ that the most rude reading in humility may profit thereby;’ secondly, against experience,—‘*I have seen, saith he, some men utterly unlearned, and scarce knowing Latin, who have gathered out of the Scripture such profound knowledge, that I marvelled at them; but the spiritual man judgeth all things.*’”³

On the subject of the *fifth* position, he had not occasion to speak; but, of course, this falls with those that have preceded it; because it is not the truth or validity of the tradition relating to matters of fact, as to the genuineness, &c. of the sacred books, or the *truth* of the tradition respecting the doctrine of the inspiration of

¹ Lib. ii. c. 25. § 10. p. 326.

² Lib. ii. c. 29. § 8. p. 357.

³ Lib. iv. c. 18. § 4. pp. 524, 5.

Scripture, that is called in question; or that such tradition is an introductory motive to induce us to believe that doctrine; but only whether this or any Church-tradition is a divine informant, an authoritative testimony, binding the conscience to immediate assent; which it is evident from the preceding extracts, that Bishop Morton did not hold it to be.

BISHOP HALL.

The extract given from Bishop Hall by Mr. Keble, consists of two sentences occurring in a sermon of his preached before Convocation in 1623,¹ which prove nothing more than that "we, of the Reformed Church," receive all those points which are maintained in "the primitive creeds," "the four General Councils," and by "the concordant judgment of the Fathers for the first six hundred years from Christ." But this is not the point in question. It is a matter totally distinct from that which Mr. Keble adduces it to support. This fact will be admitted by many who are altogether opposed to those views in support of which he urges it. And such will be found to be the case as it respects Bishop Hall, whose sentiments on the points now in question are very clearly manifested in other parts of his writings.

As it respects the *first* point, viz. the divine origin of Church-tradition, the following extracts will show Bishop Hall's mind.

"As for those traditions which they do thus lift up to an unjust *competition with the Written Word*, our Saviour hath beforehand humbled them into the dust. 'In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Matt. xv. 9. Making this a sufficient cause of abhorring both the persons and the services of those Jews, that they thrust human traditions into God's chair, and respected them equally with the institutions of God. Cardinal Bellarmin would shift it off with a *distinction of traditions*. 'These were such, saith he, *quas acceperant a recentioribus*, &c. as they had received from

¹ Works, ed. Pratt, Vol. v. p. 148 &c.

some later hands; whereof some were vain, some others pernicious; not such as they received from Moses and the Prophets.' . . . But this is to cast mists before the eyes of the simple; for who sees not that *our Saviour's challenge is general*, to TRADITIONS THUS ADVANCED, *not to these or those traditions?* And where he speaks of some later hands, he had forgotten that our Saviour upon the Mount tells him *επεθη τοις αρχαιοις*: that these faulted traditions were of old. . . . *Let them be able to deduce ANY Evangelical tradition from the Apostles, and we are ready to embrace it with all observance.*"¹

"As for oral traditions, what certainty can there be in them? What foundation of truth can be laid upon the breath of man? How do we see the reports vary of those things which our eyes have seen done! How do they multiply in their passage, and either grow or die upon hazards!"²

"What is grounded upon the divine word must needs be irrefragably true, that which upon human traditions either must or may be erroneous."³

Church-tradition, then, is no *divine* informant, according to Bishop Hall.

Let us proceed to the *second* and *third* points.

"What can be more full and clear," says the bishop, "than that of St. Austin? 'In these things which are openly laid forth in Scripture are found all matters that contain *either faith or manners.*' Cardinal Bellarmin's elusion is not a little prejudicial to his own cause. He tells us, that St. Austin speaks of those points which are simply necessary to salvation for all men, all which he acknowledges to be written by the Apostles; 'But, besides these there are many other things,' saith he, 'which we have only by tradition,' [which is just what our authors say. And how does Bishop Hall meet it? Thus.] *Will*

¹ Old Religion, ch. 12. § 2. Works, ed. Pratt, vol. 9. p. 288.

² Ib. § 3.

³ Sermon on "The best bargain." Sept. 21, 1623.

*it not therefore hence follow that the common sort of Christians need not look at his traditions?"*¹

Again; "Even the very light of reason shows us that as there is a God, so that he is a most wise and most just God. Needs, therefore, must it follow, that if this most just and wise God will give a word, whereby to reveal himself and his will to mankind, it must be *a perfect word*; for, as his wisdom knows what is fit for his creature to know of himself, so his justice will require nothing of the creature but what he hath enabled him to *know and do*. Now, then, since he requires us to know him, to obey him, it must needs follow that he hath left us *so exquisite a rule of this knowledge and obedience as cannot admit of any defect, or any supplement*. THIS RULE CAN BE NO OTHER THAN HIS WRITTEN WORD; therefore written that it might be preserved entire for this purpose to the last date of time."²

"How miserably," he sarcastically remarks, "were every one of the learned Fathers of the Church blinded, that they could *never either see or acknowledge any other rule of faith!*"³

And so in his sermon to the Synod of Dort he says, "No one can doubt that the Holy Spirit, *speaking in the sacred Scripture*, ought to be *the Judge of Controversies*."⁴

The second of these passages also clearly shows us his opinion as to the notion that there are any important revealed points not contained in Scripture, for if "the written word" is "*so exquisite a rule of this knowledge and obedience as cannot admit of any defect, or any supplement*," there cannot be any important revealed truths not conveyed to us in it, and for which we are indebted only to tradition.

The following, however, are perhaps still more clear on

¹ Old Rel. ch. 12. § 1.

² Ib. § 3.

³ No Peace with Rome, § 4.

⁴ *Judicem esse debere controversiarum Spiritum Sanctum in sacra Scriptura loquentem nemo est qui ambigat.* Conc. ad Syn. Dordr.

the point. "St. Augustine's words [alluding to the passage quoted above] are full and comprehensive, expressing *all those things which contain either faith or manners*, whether concerning *governors* or PEOPLE. *If now they can find out anything that belongs not either to belief or action, we do willingly give it up to their traditions*, but ALL THINGS WHICH PERTAIN TO EITHER OF THOSE ARE OPENLY COMPRISED IN SCRIPTURE." "Whatsoever is not written, by this rule [i. e. one quoted from Tertullian] may not be obtruded to our belief."¹

On the alleged obscurity of the Scriptures urged in the *fourth* position, his opinion may be judged from the following;—

"Yet one step more. Our question is, Whether the Scripture be easy or most obscure, and *whether in all essential points it do not INTERPRET ITSELF*, so as what is hard in one place is openly laid forth in another. Hear *the judgment of the Old Church* AND OURS. 'All things are clear and plain, and nothing contrary in the Scriptures,' saith Epiphanius. 'Those things which seem doubtfully and obscurely spoken in some places of Scripture, are expounded by them which in other places are open and plain,' saith Basil. What could Calvin and Luther say more?"

And having quoted several other passages from Augustine and Chrysostom, he concludes with the two following from the latter. "He [i. e. Chrysostom] makes this difference betwixt the philosophers and Apostles, 'The philosophers speak obscurely, but the Apostles and Prophets,' saith he, 'contrarily make all things delivered by them clear and manifest; and, *as the common teachers of the world, have so expounded all things, that EVERY MAN may OF HIMSELF by BARE READING learn those things which are spoken.*' Yea, lastly, so far he goes in this point as that he asketh, 'Wherefore needeth a preacher? all things are clear and plain in the divine Scriptures;

¹ Old Rel. ch. 12. § 1.

but because ye are delicate hearers, and seek delight in hearing, therefore ye seek for preachers.'"¹

"It is not to be imagined that the same word of God which speaks for all other truths should not speak for itself. How fully doth it display its own sufficiency and perfection! 'All Scripture,' saith the Chosen Vessel, 'is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' 2 Tim. iii. 16. 'Profitable,' saith the Cardinal, 'but not sufficient. Many things may avail to that end whereto they suffice not; so meat is profitable to nourish, but without natural heat it nourisheth not.' Thus he. Hear yet what followeth,—'That the man of God may be perfected and thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' 2 Tim. iii. 17. Lo, it is so profitable to all these services, that thereby it *perfects a divine*, MUCH MORE AN ORDINARY CHRISTIAN. That which is so profitable as to cause perfection is abundantly sufficient, and must needs have full perfection in itself. *That which can perfect the teacher is sufficient for THE LEARNER.*"²

Against the *last* position, as to our receiving the Scriptures on the authority of Church-tradition, the following may suffice.

"This is yet most shamefully injurious, to deny unto the word of God *credit of itself*, *αυτοπιστιαν*; and so to hang the Scriptures upon *the Church*, that they must needs beg all their authority from *the voices of men*."³ This remark, I need hardly observe, is as forcible against the views of the Tractators on this point, as against those of the Romanists. And in his "Serious dissuasive from Popery," (div. 2. § 5.), he quotes several passages from Augustine and Chrysostom, showing that, in their view, the Scriptures are not to be received "on the authority of the Church."

Can it be a question, then, as to what would have been

¹ Serious Diss. from Popery, Div. 2. § 3.

² Old Rel. ch. 12. § 2.

³ No Peace with Rome, § 4.

Bishop Hall's sentiments respecting the system under consideration?

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

The next witness whose testimony we propose to examine is Archbishop Laud, and there can be little doubt that the Archbishop took tolerably high views of Church-authority, and its correlative points, and accordingly he is a great favourite with the Tractators. Mr. Keble has, therefore, given us a passage from his conference with Fisher the Jesuit; *a passage, however, in which there is not one word about tradition from beginning to end.* And this is the more extraordinary, because in this very work the Archbishop has entered somewhat fully into this question of tradition; and if it shall turn out that the views of the Archbishop are entirely opposed to Mr. Keble's, then I think that the reader will agree with me in thinking that Mr. Keble's fondness for the notions he has imbibed on this subject has betrayed him into much unfairness. His reference, moreover, in this case would be singularly unfortunate, for if Archbishop Laud opposes his views, *a fortiori* are they contrary to those of the great body of the English clergy on such a point.

Now, as to the *first* point, the Archbishop says,—“Even in those fundamental things in which the whole universal Church neither doth nor can err, yet even there her authority is not divine, because she delivers those supernatural truths by promise of assistance, yet tyed to means; and not by any *special immediate revelation, which is necessarily required to the very least degree of Divine authority.* And therefore our worthies do not only say, but prove, ‘that all the Church’s constitutions are of the nature of human law.’ And some among you, not unworthy for their learning, prove it at large, ‘that all the Church’s *Testimony*, or *Voice*, or *Sentence*, (*call it what you will*,) is but *suo modo* or *aliquo modo*, not simply, but in a manner divine.’ Yea, and A. C. himself, after all his debate, comes to that and no

farther, 'That *the Tradition of the Church* is, at least in some sort, divine and infallible.' Now that which is divine but in a sort or manner, be it the Church's manner, is *aliquo modo non divina*, in a sort not divine. But this great principle of faith, the ground and proof of whatsoever else is of faith, [viz. that Scripture is the word of God,] cannot stand firm upon a proof that is and is not, in a manner and not in a manner, divine."¹

"You have been often enough told (were truth and not the maintaining of a party the thing you seek for), that *if you will show us any such unwritten word of God* delivered by his Prophets and Apostles, we will acknowledge it to be divine and infallible."² Here the ground taken by the Archbishop is manifestly what we contend for, viz. that there is nothing remaining to us which can be shown to be the word of God but the Scriptures; as is confirmed also by the following. "Therefore *Tradition* must be taken two ways. Either as it is *the Church's act delivering, or the thing thereby delivered*, AND THEN IT IS HUMAN AUTHORITY OR FROM IT, and unable infallibly to warrant divine faith, or to be the object of it. Or else, as it is the unwritten word of God, and then WHEREVER IT CAN BE MADE TO APPEAR SO, it is of divine and infallible authority, no question. But then I would have A. C. consider where he is in this particular. He tells us, 'We must know infallibly that the books of Holy Scripture are divine, and that this must be done by unwritten Tradition, but so as that this tradition is the word of God unwritten.' Now let him but prove that this or any tradition which the Church of Rome stands upon is the word of God though unwritten, and the business is ended. But A. C. must not think that because the Tradition of the Church tells me these books are Verbum Dei, God's Word, and that I do both *honour and believe* this tradition, that therefore this tradition itself is God's

¹ Relation of the Conference between Laud and Fisher, § 16. n. 6. 4th ed. 1686. p. 42.

² Ib. § 16. n. 7. pp. 43, 4.

word too, and so absolutely *sufficient and infallible to work this belief in me.*"¹ Here we see that even in that Church-tradition that Scripture is the word of God, the Archbishop utterly repudiates the idea that such a tradition is to be received as *an unwritten word of God*, a *divine* informant, or as "*sufficient and infallible to work belief in him*" of what it testifies.

These extracts, therefore, of themselves form also a complete answer to our opponents on the *fifth* point; but for that part of the question, I shall add to them presently.

The reader will see the importance of such extracts from Archbishop Laud, and therefore I make no apology for adding more. If such passages from Archbishop Laud do not settle the question as to the opposition of the views of the Tractators on this matter to those of the English Church, it is difficult to conceive what will do so.

"For the tradition of the Church, then," he says, "certain it is we must distinguish the Church before we can judge right of the validity of the Tradition. For if the speech be of *the prime Christian Church, the Apostles, disciples, and such as had IMMEDIATE REVELATION* from heaven, no question but the voice and tradition of *this Church* is divine, not *aliquo modo*, in a sort, but simply, and the word of God from them is of like validity, written or delivered. And against this tradition (of which kind this, 'That the books of Scripture is the word of God,' is the most general and uniform) the Church of England never excepted. And when St. Augustine said, 'I would not believe the gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me,' . . . : *some of your own* will not endure should be understood *save of the Church in the time of the Apostles only*, and some of the Church in general, not excluding after ages, but sure to include Christ and his Apostles. And *the certainty* is *there*, abundance of certainty *in itself*, BUT HOW FAR THAT IS EVIDENT TO US SHALL AFTER APPEAR. But this will not serve your turn. The tradition of the present Church must be as

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 9. p. 45.

infallible as that of the primitive. But the contrary to this is proved before [referring to the passage first quoted], because this voice of the present Church is not simply divine."¹

And let not Mr. Keble deceive himself here as to the meaning of the Archbishop, from his use of the phrase "the present Church;" for what he means by it is, the Church in its post-apostolic state, as is evident, not merely from the conclusion of the above sentence, but because, in another passage,² he quotes Cyril and Augustine as speaking of the present Church, and uses the phrase with reference to the time of Basil.³

And the distinction which the Archbishop makes between the tradition of the Apostles, or the Church when under their guidance, and the tradition of the post-apostolic Church, is an important one. The former only he allows to be divine, the latter he affirms to rest upon the authority of Scripture. "I have often," he says, "heard some wise men say, That the Jesuit in the Church of Rome, and the Precise Party in the Reformed Churches, agree in many things, though they would seem most to differ. And surely this is one, for both of them differ extremely about tradition. The one in magnifying it, and exalting it into *Divine authority*, the other vilifying and depressing it almost beneath human. And yet even in these different ways both agree in this consequent, 'That the sermons and preachings by word of mouth of the lawfully-sent pastors and doctors of the Church, are able to breed in us divine and infallible faith.' Nay, 'are the very word of God.'" "For [adds the Archbishop here in a note] THIS A. C. SAYS EXPRESSLY OF TRADITION."⁴ He would have been rather more surprised to hear such language from divines of the Church of England and himself quoted in support of their views.

Again; having spoken of "the tradition of the Church of the Apostles themselves," he adds, "*As for the tradi-*

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 20, 21, p. 52.

² Ib. § 16. n. 33. p. 66.

³ Ib. § 16. n. 26. p. 59.

⁴ Ib. § 16. n. 31. p. 64.

tion of after ages, in and about which miracles and divine power were not so evident, we believe them (by Gandavo's full confession) because they do not preach other things than those former, the Apostles, left IN SCRIPTIS CERTISSIMIS, IN MOST CERTAIN SCRIPTURE. And it appears by men in the middle ages, that these writings were vitiated in nothing, by the concordant consent in them of all succeeders to our own time."¹ "That we must rely upon this tradition [i. e. the tradition of the post-apostolic Church] as divine and infallible, and able to breed in us divine and infallible faith, as A. C. adds, is A PROPOSITION WHICH, IN THE TIMES OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, WOULD HAVE BEEN ACCOUNTED VERY DANGEROUS, AS INDEED IT IS. *For I would fain know why leaning too much upon tradition may not mislead Christians as well as it did the Jews.*"² "Now, since we go the same way with you so far as you go right, and a better way than you where you go wrong, WE NEED NOT ADMIT ANY OTHER WORD OF GOD THAN WE DO."³ "If this company of men [i. e. the Roman bishop and his clergy] be infallibly assisted, whence is it that this very company have *erred so dangerously as they have, not only in some other things, but even in this particular, by equalling the tradition of the present Church to the written word of God?* WHICH IS A DOCTRINE UNKNOWN TO THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, AND WHICH FRETS UPON THE VERY FOUNDATION ITSELF BY JUSTLING WITH IT;" where by *the present Church* he means, as before, *the post-apostolic Church*, as is evident from his reference to Basil, in his note on this passage.⁴

So much for Archbishop Laud's advocacy of church-tradition as a *divine* informant.

But it may be said, the Archbishop speaks also of the tradition of the Apostles, and he calls *that* divine. True, and who will not agree with him in so doing? But he also added, "How far that is evident to us shall after appear." Now *as far as that tradition was oral*, it can

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 32. p. 66.

² Ib. § 18. n. 4. *note*, p. 78.

³ Ib. § 19. n. 2. p. 82.

⁴ Ib. § 16. n. 26. p. 59.

come to us only through the medium of Church-tradition; and not only does the Archbishop deny the divine authority of that Church-tradition, but he denies it in that very point in which it is "most general and uniform," and claims, more than in all others, to be considered as delivering the prime Apostolical tradition, viz. in the point that Scripture is the word of God.

That he considers that that which comes to us as Apostolical tradition, on the authority of Church-tradition, has not divine authority, is evident from the following passage. He is still speaking as to the authority upon which we receive Scripture as the word of God, and having observed, "We use the tradition of the present Church as the first motive, not as the last resolution of our faith; we resolve *only* into prime tradition Apostolical and Scripture itself," he adds,—“Secondly, you pretend, we do not nor cannot know the prime Apostolical tradition but by the tradition of the present Church, and that, therefore, if the tradition of the present Church be not God’s unwritten word and divine, we cannot yet know Scripture to be Scripture by a divine authority. Well! suppose I could not know the prime tradition divine¹ but by the present Church, yet it doth not follow that therefore I cannot know Scripture to be the word of God by a divine authority, because divine tradition is *not the sole and only means* to prove it. For suppose I had not, nor could have, full assurance of Apostolical tradition divine, yet the moral persuasion, reason, and force of the present Church, is ground enough to move any reasonable man that it is *fit he should read* the Scripture, and esteem very *reverently and highly* of it. And this once done, the Scripture hath then *in and home arguments* enough to put a soul that hath but ordinarily grace *out of*

¹ In the edition from which I quote, that of 1686 fol., it runs, “the prime tradition *to be* divine.” But the words *to be* appear so manifestly an erratum, that I have left them out above. However, if any reader prefer the passage with them, let him so read it if he will.

doubt that Scripture is the word of God, infallible and divine.”¹

Here it is evident that the Archbishop grants, that that which comes to us as “Apostolical tradition divine” on the authority of Church-tradition, has not divine authority; and that if the Apostolical tradition that Scripture is the word of God could only be so conveyed to us, the report we thus have of it would not have divine authority. But the Archbishop evidently thought that it could be *otherwise* conveyed to us, namely, (as other passages show him to mean,) in the declarations of the Apostles *in Scripture*, that they spake by the Holy Ghost. That he is referring to this latter tradition is evident from the following among other passages;—“The Scriptures saying from the mouths of the prophets, ‘Thus saith the Lord,’ and from the mouths of the Apostles, that ‘the Holy Ghost spake by them,’ are at least as able and as fit to bear witness to their own verity, as the Church is to bear witness to her own traditions by bare saying they come from the Apostles.”² “The Jews never had, nor can have, any other proof that the Old Testament is the word of God than we have of the New. For theirs was delivered by Moses and the prophets, and ours was delivered by the Apostles, which were prophets too. The Jews did believe their Scripture by a Divine authority. For so the Jews argue themselves; St. John ix. ‘We know that God spake with Moses.’ And that therefore they could no more err in following Moses, than they could in following God himself. And our Saviour seems to infer as much, St. John v. where he expostulates with the Jews thus, ‘If you believe not Moses his writings, how should you believe me?’ Now how did the Jews know that God spake to Moses? How? Why, apparently the same way that is before set down. First, by Tradition. So St. Chrysostom; ‘We know; why, by whose witness do you know? By the testimony of our ancestors.’ *But he speaks not of their immediate ancestors,*

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 22, 23. p. 55.

² Ib. § 16. n. 10. p. 46.

but their prime, which were prophets, and whose testimony was divine, into which, NAMELY THEIR WRITINGS, the Jews did resolve their faith. . . . They resolved their faith higher, and into a more inward principle, than an ear to their immediate ancestors and their tradition.”¹ That is, the prime prophetic tradition contained in the *writings* of the Old Testament, that those writings were the word of God, was that into which the Jews resolved their faith as alone of divine authority; and in the same way the prime Apostolical tradition contained in the writings of the New Testament, that those writings are the word of God, is alone of divine authority with us on this point, and not that record of this tradition which the post-apostolic Church has delivered to us.

Now from these extracts it clearly follows that Archbishop Laud did not hold Church tradition to be any part of *the rule of faith*, for that cannot be a part of the rule of faith in things belonging to God which is not a divine informant, and has not divine authority; and indeed he directly asserts that he admits “no infallible rule but Scripture only.”² And so again, “I admit no ordinary rule left in the Church of divine and infallible verity, and so of *faith*, but the Scripture.”³

That he would have advocated the utility of Church-tradition to lead men to the acceptance of the truth, that he *accepted* the interpretation given to Scripture by the general testimony of the best antient ecclesiastical writers, and was willing to have his orthodoxy, and that of his Church, judged by it, are points readily granted, but it was not any part of his rule of faith.

On the *second*, *third*, and *fourth* points, therefore, maintained by the Tractators, these extracts show that Archbishop Laud is opposed to them.

Nay, as it respects the *fourth* point, that Church tradition is a necessary part of the rule of faith in the fundamental articles, on account of the *obscurity* of Scripture, he expresses himself thus strongly against such a notion.

¹ Ib. § 18. n. 5. p. 79. ² Ib. § 26. n. 4. p. 129. ³ Ib. § 38. n. 5. p. 215.

“ Now A. C. would know what is to be done for reuniting of a Church divided in doctrine of the Faith, when this remedy by a General Council cannot be had ; Sure Christ our Lord, saith he, hath provided some rule, some judge, in such and such like cases, to procure unity and certainty of belief. I believe so too ; for he hath left an Infallible Rule, the Scripture ; *and that by the manifest places in it, WHICH NEED NO DISPUTE, NO EXTERNAL JUDGE is able to settle unity and certainty of belief in necessities to salvation. . . .* And therefore A. C. does not well to make that a crime, that the Protestants admit no infallible rule but *the Scripture only*, or, as he (I doubt, not without some scorn) terms it, beside *only Scripture*. *For what need is there of another, since this is most infallible, and the same which the antient Church of Christ admitted?* And if it were *sufficient* for the ancient Church to guide them, and *direct their Councils*, why should it be now held insufficient for us, at least till a free General Council may be had ? And it hath both the conditions which Bellarmine requires to a rule, namely, that it be certain, and that it be known. ‘ For if it be not certain, it is no rule ; and if it be not known, it is no rule to us.’ Now the Romanists dare not deny but this rule is certain, *and that it is sufficiently known in the manifest places of it, and such as are necessary to salvation, none of the antients did ever deny ; so there’s an infallible rule. Nor need there be such fear of a private spirit in these manifest things, WHICH BEING BUT READ OR HEARD TEACH THEMSELVES.*”¹ “ The first immediate fundamental points of faith without which there is no salvation, as they cannot be proved by reason, so neither need they be determined by any Council, nor ever were they attempted, *they are so plain set down in the Scripture.*”²

As it respects the *fifth* position, we have already quoted sufficient to show how totally the Archbishop was opposed to it ; but it may be worth while to add one or two more

¹ Ib. § 26, n. 4, 5. pp. 129, 30.

² Ib. § 33, n. 5. p. 165.

extracts on that point, to show more fully the precise nature of his views respecting it.

"*I doubt,*" he says, "*this question, 'How do you know Scripture to be Scripture,' hath done more harm than you will ever be able to help by Tradition? But I must follow that way which you draw me.*"¹ "It seems to me very necessary,² that we be able to prove the books of Scripture to be the word of God by some authority that is absolutely divine. For if they be warranted unto us by any authority less than divine, then all things contained in them, which have no greater assurance than the Scripture in which they are read, are not objects of divine belief. And that once granted will enforce us to yield, that all the articles of Christian belief have no greater assurance than human or moral faith or credulity can afford. An authority, then, simply divine, must make good the Scriptures' infallibility, at least in the last resolution of our faith in that point. *This authority cannot be any testimony or voice of the Church alone. For the Church consists of men subject to error; and no one of them since the Apostles' times hath been assisted with so plentiful a measure of the Blessed Spirit as to secure him from being deceived; and all the parts being all liable to mistaking, and fallible, the whole cannot possibly be infallible in and of itself, and privileged from being deceived in some things or other. And even in those fundamental things in which the whole universal Church neither doth nor can err, yet even there her authority is not divine, because she delivers those supernatural truths by promise of assistance, yet tied to means, and not by any special immediate revelation, which is necessarily required to the very least degree of divine authority.*"³ "Tradition of

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 1. p. 38.

² Here the Archbishop adds in a note,—“And this is so necessary, that Bellarmine confesses, that if Tradition, which he relies upon, be not divine, he and his can have no faith. Non habemus fidem. Fides enim verbo Dei nititur. L. 4. De Verbo Dei. c. 4. §. At si ita est.”

³ Ib. § 16. n. 6. p. 42.

the present Church is the first moral motive to belief. *But the belief itself, That the Scripture is the word of God, rests upon the Scripture.*" And he adds, in a note, " Orig. 4. *περι αρχων*, c. 1, went this way, yet was he a great deal nearer the prime tradition than we are. For being to prove that the Scriptures were inspired from God, he saith, ' De hoc assignabimus ex ipsis divinis Scripturis, quæ nos competenter moverint,' &c."¹ " When, therefore, the Fathers say, ' We have the Scriptures by tradition,' or the like, either they mean the tradition of the Apostles themselves delivering it, and there *when it is known* to be such [the italics are the Archbishop's] we may resolve our faith; or if they speak of the present Church, then they mean that the tradition of it is that by which we *first* receive the Scripture, as by an according means to the prime tradition. But because it is not simply divine, we cannot resolve our faith into it, nor settle our faith upon it, till it resolve itself into the prime tradition of the Apostles or the Scripture, or both; and there we rest with it. *And you cannot show an ordinary consent of Fathers, nay can you, or any of your Quarter, show any one Father of the Church, Greek or Latin, that ever said, we are to resolve our faith that Scripture is the word of God into the tradition of the present Church?*"² " So then the way lies thus (as far as it appears to me); The credit of Scripture to be divine resolves finally into that faith which we have touching God himself, and in the same order. For as that, so this hath three main grounds to which all other are reducible. The first is, the tradition of the Church, and this leads us to a reverent persuasion of it. The second is, the light of nature, and this shows us how necessary such a revealed learning is, and that no other way it can be had. Nay more, that all proofs brought against any point of faith neither are nor can be demonstrations, but soluble arguments. The third is, the light of the text itself, in conversing where-with we meet with the Spirit of God inwardly inclining

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 21. p. 54.² Ib. § 16. n. 33. p. 66.

our hearts, and sealing the full assurance of the sufficiency of all three unto us. And then, and not before, we are certain that the Scripture is the word of God, both by divine and by infallible proof. But our certainty is by faith, and so voluntary, not by knowledge of such principles as in the light of nature can enforce assent whether we will or no.”¹ “Certain it is, that by human authority, consent, and proof, a man may be assured infallibly that the Scripture is the word of God, by an acquired habit of faith, *cui non subest falsum*, under which nor error nor falsehood is. But he cannot be assured infallibly, *by divine faith*, *cui subesse non potest falsum*, into which no falsehood *can come*, but by a *divine testimony*. *This testimony is absolute in Scripture itself, delivered by the Apostles for the word of God, and so sealed to our souls by the operation of the Holy Ghost*. That which makes way for this as *an introduction and outward motive*, is *the tradition of the present Church*.”² “Tradition doth but *morally* and *probably* confirm the authority of Scripture.”³

So also as to the accuracy of our copies of the Scriptures, the Archbishop says, “As it [i. e. tradition] is the *first moral inducement* to persuade that Scripture is the word of God, so is it also the *first but moral* still that the Bible we now have is a true copy of that which was first written. But then, as in the former, so in this latter for the true copy, the last resolution of our faith cannot possibly rest upon the naked tradition of the present Church, but must by and with it go higher to other helps and assurances. *Where I hope A. C. will confess we have greater helps to discover the truth or falsehood of a copy than we have means to look into a tradition*; or especially to sift out this truth, That it was a divine and infallible revelation by which the originals of Scripture were first written; that being far more the subject of this inquiry than the copy, *which according to art and science may be*

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 34. punct. 9. p. 74.

² Ib. § 19. n. 1. pp. 80, 81.

³ Ib. § 16. n. 31. p. 63.

*examined by former preceding copies close up to the very Apostles' times."*¹ "The Scripture being put in writing is a thing visibly existent, and if any error be in the print, it is easily corrigible by former copies. *Tradition is not so easily observed, nor so safely kept."*²

I might add other points of disagreement between Archbishop Laud and the Tractators, not unimportant; such, for instance, as that General Councils *may* err against "fundamental verity," though not "easily;"³ and the jealousy of the Tractators of the term *Protestant* being applied to the Church of England, while the Archbishop expressly applies that appellation to her, and uniformly includes her as part of the Protestant Body. "*The Church of England*," he says, "*is Protestant too.*"⁴ But into these points our limits forbid us to enter.

The extracts given above, then, clearly show, that at least in all the *main* points of the system under review the Archbishop was entirely opposed to the views of the Tractators.

DR. THOMAS JACKSON.

The next author to whose testimony I would draw the attention of the reader, is that learned and able divine, Dr. Thomas Jackson. The extract which Mr. Keble has given us from his writings certainly cannot be said to be an unfair one, for testimony more explicit and direct than it contains against the system under review, the most decided opponent of that system could hardly desire. For instance, let the reader observe the following passages, taken from that extract: "Our Church, according to Vincentius his rule, admits a growth or proficiency in faith, in that it holds not only those propositions which are expressly contained in Scripture, but such as may *by necessary consequence* be deduced out of them for points of faith, and *this growth* is still *in eodem genere, from the same root*. Other points of faith besides these our Church

¹ Ib. § 16. n. 30. p. 63.

² Ib. § 16. n. 27. pp. 59, 60.

³ Ib. § 32. n. 5. p. 178.

⁴ Ib. § 35. n. 6. punct. 4. p. 192.

admitteth none, but ties even her Prelates and Governors to obtrude no other doctrines as points of faith upon their auditors, than *such as are either expressly contained in Scriptures, or may infallibly be deduced from them.*" (p. 21.)

"The second addition made by the Roman Church unto the antient canon of faith is a transcendent one and illimited; and that is, *the making of ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the canon of faith.* THIS DOETH NOT ONLY POLLUTE BUT UNDERMINE THE WHOLE FABRIC OF THE HOLY PRIMITIVE AND CATHOLIC FAITH." (p. 23.)

And lest the Tractators should say that this only refers to Romish traditions which have no ground in Scripture, not to Church tradition as the *expounder* of Scripture, let us observe what follows;—"We affirm with antiquity, and in particular with Vincentius Lirinensis, that the Canon of Scripture is a rule of faith, perfect for quantity, AND SUFFICIENT FOR QUALITY; that is, it contains all things in it that are necessary to salvation, or requisite to be contained in any rule; *and so contains them as they may be believed and understood without relying on any other rule or authority equivalent to them in certainty,* or more authentic in respect of us than the Scriptures are. The modern Romish Church denies the Canon of Scripture to be perfect and complete in respect of its quantity, or *sufficient for its quality or efficacy.*" (p. 23.)

"*When we reject ecclesiastical tradition from being any part of the rule of faith,* we do not altogether deny the authority or use of it. Howbeit that ecclesiastical tradition, whereof there was such excellent use in the primitive Church, was not unwritten tradition. . . . That ecclesiastical tradition which Vincentius Lirinensis so much commends, did especially consist in the confessions or registers of particular Churches.¹ Now the unanimous consent of so many several Churches as exhibited their confessions to the Nicene Council, being not dependent one of

¹ How far this is correct we are not here concerned to inquire. The only question here is as to the views of Dr. Jackson himself on our present subject.

another, not overruled by authority, nor misled by faction was a *pregnant argument* to any impartial understanding man that this faith wherein they all agreed had been delivered unto them by the Apostles and their followers.¹ . . . HOWBEIT THIS UNANIMOUS TRADITION ECCLESIASTIC WAS NOT IN THESE TIMES HELD FOR ANY PROPER PART OF THE RULE OF FAITH, BUT ALLEGED ONLY AS AN INDUCEMENT TO INCLINE THE HEARTS OF SUCH AS BEFORE ACKNOWLEDGED THE WRITTEN WORD FOR THE ONLY RULE OF FAITH, TO BELIEVE THAT THE INTERPRETATIONS OR DECISIONS OF THOSE COUNCILS DID CONTAIN THE TRUE SENSE AND MEANING OF THE RULE ACKNOWLEDGED BY ALL. . . . The chief authority which the visible Church then challenged did consist in the unanimous consent of the ecclesiastic tradition, and that, as was said before, BUT AN INDUCEMENT to embrace the interpretations of the present Church, and reject the interpretations of upstart heretics." (pp. 23—25.) "But although heresies of long standing and continuance cannot be refuted, nor may not be assaulted, in Vincentius's judgment, by the former method, that is, by multitude of suffragants, or joint consent of several Provinces, is there therefore no other means left to *convince* them, no way left to *eschew* them? Yes, we may *eschew* them, saith he, as already condemned by antient and orthodoxal Councils, or we may *convince* them, so it be needful or expedient, by *the sole authority of Scriptures*. Now, if the Scriptures be sufficient to convince heresies of long continuance or long standing, and to confute such heretics as want neither wit, will, nor opportunity to falsify antient records, and imprint traditions of their own coining with inscriptions of antiquity, I hope the same Scripture was, in Vincentius's judgment, a rule of faith neither incomplete for its

¹ That there is no sufficient authority for this statement I have already shown in the observations on the Council of Nice, in chap. 10.

quantity, nor *insufficient for its quality*; A RULE EVERY WAY COMPETENT FOR ENDING CONTROVERSIES IN RELIGION, WITHOUT THE ASSUMPTION EITHER OF TRADITION OR DECREES OF COUNCIL AS ANY ASSOCIATES OR HOMOGENEAL PARTS OF THE SAME RULE." (pp. 26, 7.) "Unto what use, then, did ecclesiastical tradition or General Councils serve for quelling heresies? Ecclesiastical traditions, or *unanimous consent of particular Churches throughout several kingdoms or provinces in points of faith*¹ was in antient times, and yet may be, an excellent *means* by which the Spirit of God leads General Councils into the truth. . . . Into the same truths which these Councils were then we now are led, not by relying upon the sole authority of the Councils which the Spirit did lead, but by tracing their footsteps and viewing the way by which the Spirit did lead them. And this was *by necessary deductions or consequences, which reason, enlightened by the Spirit*, and directed by the sweet disposition of Divine Providence, *did teach them to make*, and doth enable us to judge that they were truly made by them." (p. 27.)

Such are the clear statements of sound Protestant doctrine contained in the very extract given by Mr. Keble. Of what use Mr. Keble supposed they could be to his cause, it is difficult to see, except that they referred to the canon of Vincent of Lerins. But the way in which that canon is here applied, be it observed, is very different to that in which the Tractators and even Vincent himself apply it. In fact, Dr. Jackson applies it merely in a way in which few Protestants would disallow its applicability and use; just as many other of our divines have quoted it as, to a certain extent and within certain limits, a useful rule. But here, as in other cases, a casual recognition to a certain extent of this Rule of Vincent, is taken advantage of by Mr. Keble, to lead the reader to the conclusion that Dr. Jackson supports the use made of that rule by the Tractators.

¹ He does not speak of it, let us observe, as if it were the consent of the whole body of believers.

And in the next chapter to those from which Mr. Keble has quoted, Dr. Jackson adds the following testimony on this subject, "It is their doctrine . . . if any controversy should arise *concerning the meaning of those Scriptures* which she hath determined to be canonical, or concerning the meaning, limitation, or use of those traditions which she hath acknowledged to be authentic, *no private man may take upon him absolutely to believe this or that to be the meaning of either, but with submission of his judgment to the Church's sentence.* And this, as I have elsewhere showed at large (Bk. 3. Sect. 4.), *is not only to make the authority of the Church to be above the authority of the Scriptures, but utterly to nullify the authority of the Scriptures, save only so far as they may serve as a stale or foot-stool to support or hold up the authority of THE CHURCH or Pope.*"¹ A sentence which precisely and in terms overthrows the system of the Tractators.

But though these passages are clear enough to show the opposition of his views to those of the system under consideration, there are others, in his 2nd and 3rd books on the Creed, if possible still more clear and pertinent to the points under consideration, to which, therefore, I now proceed.

As it respects the *first* position, namely, that Church-tradition is a divine informant, the following brief declaration may be sufficient. "*Revelations from above we acknowledge none but the written word: they [i. e. the Romanists] acknowledge traditions as well as it.*"²

As it respects the *second* and *third* positions, that Church-tradition is part of the rule of faith as the interpreter of the Scriptures, &c. we may judge of his opinion by the following passages.

First, as it respects its alleged authority as the interpreter of the Scriptures.

"Let us see," says Dr. Jackson, "whether the *sense* and *meaning* of these Scriptures, which both they and we hold for canonical, may not be known, understood, and fully

¹ On the Creed, bk. 12. c. 23.

² Bk. 2. sect. 4. c. 5.

assented unto, immediately and in themselves, without relying upon ANY visible Church or congregation of men, from whose doctrine we must frame our belief without distrust of error or examination of their decrees with any intention to reform them or swerve from them. That the Scripture is not the rule whereon private men, especially unlearned, ought to rely in matters of faith, from these general reasons or topics they seek to persuade us. First, &c. &c.”¹

And proceeding afterwards to point out the principal points of difference between him and the Romanists, he sums them up in the two following. “First, whether Christ, whose authority both acknowledge for infallible, hath left any public judge of these Scriptures, which both receive, OR OF THEIR RIGHT SENSE AND MEANING, from whose sentence we may not appeal; or whether all to whom this ministry of faith is committed be but expositors of Divine Scriptures, so as *their expositions may by ALL faithful Christians be examined*. Hence ariseth that other question, whether the Scriptures be the infallible rule of faith. *If Scripture admit any judge, then is it no rule of faith*. If all doctrines are to be examined by Scripture, then is it a perfect rule.” And speaking of the obedience required by Romanists to the Church, he says, “The reasons pretended for this absolute obedience to be performed unto the Church or visible company of men, are drawn from the insufficiency of Scripture, either for notifying itself to be the word of God, *or the true sense and meaning of itself*.”

Hence proceeding to state his own views, he says,—“We affirm that *the infallible rule* whereupon *every Christian*, in matters of written verities, *absolutely and finally, without all appeal, condition, or reservation*, is to rely, must be *the divine written oracles themselves*; some of which *every Christian* hath written in his heart by *the finger of God's Spirit*, and believes immediately in and for themselves, not for any authority of men, and these to

¹ Bk. 2. sect. 1. c. 1.

him must be the rule for examining all other doctrines and trying any matters of faith.”¹ “When we affirm that the Scriptures are *the only infallible rule* in matters of faith and Christian obedience, we understand such a rule in those matters as Aristotle’s Organon may be said of Logic, supposing it were sound and free from all suspicion of error in every point, and contained in it all the general and undoubted principles from which all true form of argumentation must be deduced, and into which all must be finally resolved. To illustrate this truth by a known practice. Our *younger students* are bound to yield their absolute assent unto Aristotle’s authority in matters of Logic, *but not unto any interpreter that shall pretend it, save only when he shall make evident unto them that this was Aristotle’s meaning.* And while they so only and no otherwise yield their assent, they yield it wholly and immediately unto Aristotle, not to the interpreter, although by his means they came to know Aristotle’s meaning, which once known, without any further confirmation of other testimony or authority, commands their obedience and assent. But ere they can fully assent unto this great Master, or thoroughly perceive his meaning, they must **CONDITIONALLY** assent unto their private Tutors or other Expositors, and take his sense and meaning upon their trust and credit. In like manner, say we, in all matters, doctrines, or controversies of faith and Christian obedience, we are bound to yield our assent directly, absolutely, and finally, *unto the authority of Scriptures ONLY*; not unto any Doctor, Expositor, or other, whosoever he be that shall pretend authority out of Scripture over our faith, *save only when he shall make it clear and evident unto us that his opinion is the true meaning of the Scripture. . . .* And before we be brought to see their truth with our own eyes, and feel it by our sense, by the effects or experiments of it upon our own souls, we are to *limit* our assent and obedience, as it is set down before, according to the probabilities or impartial inducements which we

¹ Bk. 2. sect. 1. c. 3.

have of the Expositors' skill and sincerity in dispensing Divine mysteries."

Proceeding to discuss the question, "In what sense the Scriptures may be said [to be] the rule of men's faith *altogether illiterate*," he observes, "Here it will be demanded, how men altogether illiterate can examine any doctrine by Scriptures? If they *cannot read* them, how shall they examine anything by them? not examining the points of faith by them, how can they be said to be the rule of your faith? In such a sense as Aristotle's works, supposing them only authentic, and all his opposites counterfeits or new-fangles, may be said to be the rule of blind men's logic; for albeit they cannot read his works, yet are they *capable of his general and undoubted rules*, seeing they have, as well as other men, a natural faculty of discerning truth from falsehood, and can distinguish betwixt rules derived from the pure fountain of truth in that kind, and precepts drawn from conjectural, erroneous, and corrupt surmises of shallow brains, if both be distinctly proposed to them. And the rules of truth once fully apprehended and embraced, serve as a touchstone to discern all consequences and conclusions which shall be suggested unto them by others, so as they will admit of nothing for sound and true logic, but what may be resolved into the former, or some other principles, which they can perspicuously and immediately discern to have been drawn from the fountain of truth by the same natural faculty or ability by which they did discern the former, for the faculty will still be like affected with all principles of like nature, use, and perspicuity. In like sort must the first and general principles of faith be derived from Scriptures, *the only pure fountain of supernatural truths*, unto all illiterate hearts by the ministry of the learned. For hearts, though illiterate, once illuminated by God's Spirit, are as apt to discern spiritual principles from falsehood or carnal conjectures, as the natural man is to discern natural truths from errors of the same kind. And these general and fundamental principles of faith,

engrafted in their hearts, serve as infallible rules for discerning the consonancy or dissonancy of such particulars as shall be suggested unto them. . . . If they doubt of any man's doctrine whether it be truly spiritual or consonant to the foundation of faith, they [i. e. the "altogether illiterate" who "cannot read"] may appeal to Scriptures, as they shall be expounded to them by others. Finally, they are tied to no visible company of men, whom they must under pain of damnation follow." "For conclusion, the Scripture, according to our doctrine and the general consent of reformed Churches, is *the only infallible rule of faith* IN BOTH RESPECTS OR CONDITIONS OF A PERFECT RULE. First, in that it contains all the principles of faith and points of salvation, so that no visible Church on earth may commend any doctrine to others, as a doctrine of faith, unless it be commended to them for such by the Scriptures, by which every one's doctrine that acknowledgeth God for his Lord must be examined as by a law uncontrollable. SECONDLY, IN THAT THESE PRINCIPLES OF FAITH ARE PLAINLY, PERSPICUOUSLY, AND DISTINCTLY SET DOWN TO THE CAPACITIES OF ALL THAT FAITHFULLY FOLLOW THEIR PRACTICAL RULES MOST PLAIN, MOST PERSPICUOUS, AND EASY, TO ALL CAPABLE OF ANY RULE OR REASON. So that this sacred Canon needs no associate, no addition of any authority as equally infallible, nor *more perspicuous* than itself, to supply what it wants; only the ministry of men skilful and industrious in the search or exposition of it, is to be supposed. *And ALL THESE, be they never so excellent and well conversant in them, are unto Scriptures but as the ordinary expositors of classic and authentic books are unto the chief authors or inventors of the science contained in them, supposing that the first authors were men of extraordinary and INFALLIBLE skill, and their expositors, as they usually are, but of ordinary capacity or experience in those faculties.*"¹

The subject of the 3rd section of the same book is, "That the continual practice of heretics in urging Scrip-

¹ Bk. 2. sect. 1. c. 11.

tures for to establish heresy, and the diversity of opinions amongst the learned about the sense of them, is *no just exception* why they should not be acknowledged as *the sole entire and complete rule of faith.*" And in it he observes,—“It hath been the practice of heretics, say they, to misinterpret Scriptures, and pretend their authority for countenancing errors. This wounds not us, except we were naked of all syllogistical armour of proof. For they should prove, if they will conclude ought to our prejudice, that *none but heretics* have used Scriptures' authority to confirm their opinions. For if orthodox and truly religious writers in the best and flourishing ages of the Church, have been as copious and industrious in citing authorities of Scriptures for their opinions as heretics, this argument proves nothing against us, why we may not be orthodoxes and true Catholics, as well as heretics. . . . *It hath been the practice of sundry heretics, never of any orthodox, to refuse their trial by Scripture, and flie unto traditions* . . . The devil, we all know, did urge the Scripture to our Saviour with great skill and dexterity. . . . But with what weapon did our Saviour vanquish Satan, that had set upon him with Scripture? Did he charge him, *sub pœna anathematis*, to be silent?—or did he crave the Church's peace under pain of greater penalties?—or did he appeal unto the infallible authority or supreme tribunal of the Jewish Church? Did he except against him for using an unlawful heretical weapon? Can you deny that he foiled him with these very weapons, wherewith we now contend that all heretics, Satan's followers, are to be assaulted and repulsed, ere they can be lawfully foiled and quite overthrown?” (ch. 2.) “*How far the Fathers did urge the Church's authority, how the most pregnant speeches that can be found in any of their writings must be limited, will easily appear, if we consider the two former distinctions; the one between the infallible rule of faith, and the means or motives inducing us to believe; the other between that conditional assent, which, in cases doubtful, we must give to the visible Church, and that*

absolute belief, which is only due unto Scriptures. The Fathers used the Church's authority against heretics, as we do theirs against novelists ; not as a rule whereby finally to examine or determine divine truths, but as a curb to bridle presumptuous gainsaying opinions generally received, or supposed for true, by men of sincerity and skill in divine mysteries." (ch. 3.)

And, in the fifth chapter, he undertakes to prove "the sufficiency of Scriptures for final determination of controversies in religion, proved by our Saviour's and his Apostles' authority and practice." And he observes in it, "The strength of all their arguments in the point now in hand to this day continues this, We must not make Scriptures the rule of faith, because many heresies have sprung thence, and great dissensions grown in the Church ; whiles one follows one sense, and another the contrary. *Whereas, in truth, the only antidote against contentions, schisms and heresies, is to read them attentively, and with such preparation as they prescribe.*" (ch. 5.)

His 7th chapter is upon the question, "How far, upon what terms or grounds, we may, with modesty, dissent from the ancients or others of more excellent gifts than ourselves," and in it he speaks thus ;—"Christianity itself binds ALL Christians not to believe men's authority against their own consciences, nor to admit of their doctrines for rules of faith, be they never so excellent ; unless *they can discern* them to be the doctrine of that great Prophet, *cui Deus non admetitur Spiritum*. He cannot fail in anything ; and whatsoever he saith, or what his Spirit shall witness to my spirit to have proceeded from him, I am bound to believe. But for men to whom God gives his Spirit but in measure, albeit in great measure, because I cannot know the particulars unto which it extends, I neither may absolutely refuse, nor absolutely admit their doctrines for true, until I see perfectly how they agree with, or disagree from, his doctrine of whose fulness we have all received. And even the truth of their writings to whom he hath given his gifts in great measure,

I am to examine by their consonancy unto that small measure of his undoubted gifts in myself, so far as they concern myself, or others committed to my charge. And *in the confidence of God's promises* for the increase of faith and grace to all such as use them aright, *every Christian* in sobriety of spirit may, by the principles of faith planted by God's finger in his heart, examine the sentences and decrees of the wisest men on earth; to approve them, if he can discern them for true; to confute them, if false; to suspend his judgment, and limit the terms of his disobedience unto them, if doubtful; and finally, to admit or reject them, according to the degrees of their probability or improbability, which he, upon sober, diligent, and impartial search, directed and continued in reverence of God's word and sincere love of truth, shall find in them."

"Thus much may now suffice, that no man ought to be dismayed in seeking or despair to find the true sense and meaning of Scriptures in all points necessary for him in his calling, because other men, much more expert in all kind of learning than himself, have foully erred in this search; and finally missed of that they sought. For out of the rules of Scripture already set down, when such temptations shall arise in our breasts, we may quell them thus. They who have gone astray were much better learned than I in all kind of knowledge. It may be they were hence more confident of their gifts . . . but I will seek to glory only in the Lord . . . I will not be high-minded, but fear; for the same Scripture tells me, *Deus dat gratiam humilibus*, yea, grace to understand the true sense and meaning of his gracious promises made in Christ Yea, but they who first instructed me in thy word, do dissent from me in the interpretation of it. It may be they have not followed those rules which thou taughtest them; Lord, give me grace to meditate aright upon thy testimonies, so shall I have more understanding than my teachers. *But what if the most reverend and ancient Fathers of former times were of a contrary mind? O Lord, they were faithful servants in thy house, and yet*

faithful but as servants, not as thy Son ; and it may be thou didst suffer those, thy worthy servants, to go awry, to try whether I, thy most unworthy servant, would forsake the footsteps of thine anointed Son, to follow them ; but, Lord, teach me thy statutes, so shall I in this point, wherein I differ from them, have more understanding than the antient."

In the last section of this book, which is concerning the means we have for composing controversies, occur the following remarks, further illustrating his views on the subject we are considering. "The last objection is, Our Church hath no means of taking up controversies, seeing we permit the use of Scriptures unto all and every man to follow that sense of them which he liketh best. We do, indeed, permit every man to satisfy his own conscience in matters of salvation ; and God forbid,—for, by his Apostles, he hath forbidden,—we should usurp any supreme lordship or absolute dominion over their faith. Yet a Christian obedience unto pastors we require in the flock, impossible in our judgment to be performed aright, unless undertaken more for conscience, than for fear of punishment. And as obedience, if not framed by conscience, can never be sincere, so conscience, unless regulated by *the sacred Canon*, must needs be erroneous, and always relish more of superstition than religion." (Sect. 4. Intro.) "We bind no man, upon pain of damnation, to believe any point of doctrine which is not *plainly and expressly* set down in Scriptures." (ch. 2.) "Besides the external helps of an ordinary ministry or magistracy, alike common to all nations, the holy Spirit is everywhere assistant to all such as seek him in the written word by him revealed ; whose live-characters are as the prints or footsteps of his wonted motions in God's prophets' or apostles' hearts, by which the faithful may discern his approach or presence in their own." "Let us now, in sobriety of spirit, rather dispute of God's will, than his power ; as whether there be any sure argument to persuade us that it was his intent or purpose, either *to instruct men in the true sense of Scriptures*, or to take up all

controversies in matters of faith, by this supposed infallibility of some visible Church. . . . That the sense of Scriptures cannot be had without the assistance or working of God's Spirit, both jointly acknowledge. 'They must be understood and interpreted, saith Bellarmine, by the same Spirit which wrote them,' as he very well gathers out of St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 20, 21.) Whence, likewise, he well collects that the whole difficulty in this question about taking up controversies, and finding out the true sense of Scriptures, consists in this, *Where this Spirit is, and where the distressed soul and doubtful conscience ought to seek it Every man, say we, ought to seek the Spirit of God in his own soul and conscience, being directed and ruled by the sacred word which was revealed and uttered by the same Spirit. This word directs them in this search; and the Spirit once found out, or rather finding them thus seeking him, establisheth their assent unto the word already revealed and written, by imprinting the same invisible word, or the true sense and meaning of it, in their hearts.*" [A declaration which is as much opposed to the views of the Tractators, as to those of the Romanists, on this point.] (ch. 5.)

And these passages clearly show what his opinion was as to the notion of there being important truths not contained in Scripture, as, for instance, where he says, "Revelations from above we acknowledge none, but the written word;"¹ and "No visible Church on earth may commend *any* doctrine to others, as a doctrine of faith, unless it be commended to them for such by the Scriptures."² To which the following may be added, that "the written word" is "sole umpire in all controversies of *religion*."³ So that whatever truth or doctrine may be proposed to us not contained in the Scriptures, it is, in his view, only from a human and uninspired source, and therefore not a doctrine of faith.

¹ Bk. ii. Sect. 4. c. 5.

² Bk. ii. Sect. 1. c. 11.

³ Bk. ii. Sect. 3. c. 5.

As it respects the Rule of practice, his subject not leading him to speak of it, the reader must judge what his views are likely to have been respecting it, from the above passages.

As it respects the *fourth* position on the *necessity* of Church-tradition as part of the rule of faith, on account of the *obscurity* of Scripture, thus he speaks.

This point forms the subject-matter of the second section of his second book, which he thus entitles, "That the *pretended* obscurity of Scriptures is no just exception why they should not be acknowledged the absolute rule of faith, which is *the mother-objection of the Romanist*." In discussing this point, he shows, in the first chapter, "How far it may be granted the Scriptures are obscure." "It is first," he says, "to be supposed that these Scriptures were given by God for the instruction of all succeeding ages, *for all sorts of men in every age, for all degrees or divers measures of his other gifts in all several sorts or conditions of men* . . . Some part of God's will contained in Scripture, is revealed in one age, some in another; always that which is most necessary for the present time, is most easy to be understood by the faithful then living, so they seek the meaning of it as they should. . . . The like observation we may take from the diversity of place or nations Again, from the divers conditions of men living in the same age, this resolution is most evident and most certain. The same portion of Scripture may be difficult unto some sort of men, and easy unto others; *without any prejudice to their sufficiency for being the perfect and infallible rule of faith to all* . . . *That the Scriptures, therefore, may be said a sufficient rule of faith and Christian carriage* TO ALL SORTS OR CONDITIONS OF MEN, it is sufficient that every Christian man, of what sort or condition soever, may have *the general and necessary points* of Catholic faith, and such particulars as belong unto a *Christian and religious carriage* in his own vocation, *perspicuously and plainly* set down in them. And no doubt but it was God's will to have them in mat-

ters concerning one calling, not so facile unto such as were of another profession, that every man might hence learn sobriety, and be occasioned to seek, if not only, yet principally, after the true sense and meaning of those Scriptures which either necessarily concern all, or must direct him in that Christian course of life whereunto his God hath called him. *But shall this difficulty of some parts, which ariseth from the diversity of vocations, be thought any hindrance why the whole Canon of Scriptures should not be a perfect rule to all in their several vocations?* . . . Thirdly, from the diversity of capacities, or different measure of God's gifts in men of the same profession, we may safely conclude that the difficulty of the same portion of Scriptures unto some, and facility and perspicuity unto others of like profession, cannot justly impeach them of greater obscurity than befits *the infallible rule, as well of theirs as of all other men's faith, in their several vocations.*" (ch. 1.)

Proceeding in the next chapter to discuss "The true state of the question about the Scriptures' obscurity or perspicuity, unto what men and for what causes they are obscure," he observes, "The question, then, must be, whether the Scriptures be an absolute rule of Christian faith and manners to *every man* in his vocation and order, according to the measure of God's gifts bestowed upon him. WE AFFIRM, IT IS SUCH TO ALL. None are so cunning, none so excellent or expert in divine mysteries, but must take it for a rule, beyond whose bounds they may not pass, from which they daily may learn more; NONE SO SILLY BUT MAY THENCE LEARN ENOUGH FOR THEIR SALVATION, SO THEY WILL BE RULED BY IT." And the obscurity to *some* arises only from their being "for their sins" "punished with spiritual darkness," and "this blindness befalls only such as have deserved it by the fore-mentioned sins, which once removed by repentance the rule of life shall enlighten them." "Unto such as they [i. e. the Jews] were, we acknowledge the Scriptures by the just judgment of God to be most difficult still, but

deny such difficulties to be any bar why they should not be the complete rule of faith. If the Jesuits will avouch the contrary, let them tell us whether any other rule could in this case supply their defect." (ch. 2.)

And in the next chapter, showing "How men must be qualified ere they can understand Scriptures aright," he proves that Scripture itself declares "that unto such as do the will of God, and practise according to his precepts, the same word shall be plain and easy, so far as is necessary for salvation." "It is the nature and property," he says, "of God's word to be plain and facile unto such as are of disposition semblable to it, as to the sincere of heart, single in life and plain in dealing, but obscure and difficult unto the worldly wise." (ch. 3.)

In the next chapter, he shows that "The Romanists' objections against the Scriptures for being obscure, do *more directly impeach their first Author and his messengers* their penmen than us or the cause in hand," and he remarks,—“St. John saith he wrote his Gospel ‘*that we might believe.*’ By what authority did he undertake, by whose assistance did he perform this work? Undertaken it was by God's appointment, effected by the assistance of his Eternal Spirit, to the end we might believe the truth. What truth? That which he wrote concerning the mysteries of man's salvation. But how far did he intend this our belief of such mysteries should be set forward by his pen? Unto the first rudiments only, or unto the midway of our course to heaven? Questionless unto the utmost period of all our hopes, for he wrote these things that we *might believe*, yea so believe in Christ, as by *believing we might have life through his name.* (John xx. 31.) Was he assisted by the Eternal Spirit, who then perfectly knew the several tempers and capacities of every age? And did he by his direction aim at the perfect belief of succeeding ages as the end and scope of all his writings? And yet did he write so obscurely that he could not be understood of them for whose good he wrote? Out of controversy his desire was to be understood of all, for

he envied no man knowledge, nor taught he the faith of our glorious Lord Jesus Christ with respect of persons. He wished that not the great Agrippas, or some few choice ones only, but ALL that should hear or read his writings to the world's end might be not almost but altogether such as he was, faithful believers. From his fervent desire of so happy an end as the salvation of all, he so earnestly sought the only correspondent means, to wit, posterity's full instruction in the mysteries thereto belonging. . . . Do not all the Evangelists aim at the same end?" And, after adding much more to the same purpose, he concludes, "Oh! that they could remember this who have forgotten their God and cannot see that *whosoever accuseth the Scriptures of difficulty or obscurity doth indict the Omnipotent of impotency* in not being able to perform what by his Apostles he intended." (ch. 4.)

The subject of his next chapter therefore is, "That *all the pretences of Scriptures' obscurity are but mists and vapours* arising from the corruption of the flesh, and may by the pure light of Scriptures, rightly applied, easily be dispelled." "Unto this," he says, "and all demands of like nature, 'If the Scriptures be not obscure, how chanceth it that so many find such difficulties in them, even in those places which seem to contain in them matters of faith,' the answer is already given. It was the Almighty's good pleasure to decree that the Scriptures should be *plain and easy* to such as faithfully practise their most plain and easy precepts, but hard and difficult to be understood aright of such as wilfully transgress them, or, knowing them to be God's word, do not glorify them as his word. . . . This answer notwithstanding, though most true, will not satisfy all. For seeing this blindness in most men is not voluntary at the least, not wilful or affected, the captious will yet demand, How shall they help it? The Scriptures plainly teach how they may be holpen. What can be more plain than that rule, 'If any man want wisdom, let him ask of God,' (James i. 5.)? Yea many do so, and yet go without it. So they must, as the Scrip-

ture telleth us, if they ask amiss. Doth the Scripture, then, serve as a straight rule to direct them how they should ask aright? Yes; for what rule can be more plain than that of St. John, ‘Whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things which are pleasing in his sight.’ (1 John iii. 22.) The promise indeed is plain, but the condition hard, for the first thing we would ask of God is grace to keep his commandments. But what hope have sinners to receive this, seeing he heareth only such as keep his commandments? Will this or any other rule of Scripture help us out of this labyrinth? It will not fail us nor forsake us. For if we have but a desire to amend our lives, Christ’s words are as plain as forcible, ‘He quencheth not smoking flax, a bruised reed he will not break.’ (Matt. xii. 20.) And this is his commandment, that we try the truth of this and other like sayings of comfort, by relying upon his mercy; or if we do but seek after repentance, we do that which is pleasing in his sight. For he is not pleased in the death of a sinner, but rejoiceth at his repentance.” “Surely more blind than beetles must they be that can suffer themselves to be persuaded that ever God or Christ would have a rule for man’s direction in the mysteries of salvation so plain and easy as he should not need to be beholden to his Maker and Redeemer for the true and perfect understanding of it. This is a wisdom and gift which cometh only from above, and must be daily and earnestly sought for at the hands of God.” (ch. 5.)

In the next chapter he proceeds to prove, “That the Mosaical writings were a most perfect rule, plain and easy to the antient Israelites,” in which he observes, “Nothing can be made more evident than this truth is in itself, That the Israelites swerving from this rule was the cause of their departure from their God, and the occasion or cause of their swerving from it was this devilish persuasion which Satan suggested to them then as the Jesuits do unto the Christian people now, as that this law was too

obscure, too hard, too difficult, to be understood, nor *a complete rule for their actions without traditions*, or relying upon their priests or men in chief authority. This hypocrisy Moses did well foresee would be the beginning of all their miseries, *the very watchword to apostasy.*" (ch. 6.)

And in the next chapter, "concluding the controversy," he says,—“ We may conclude this point with our Apostle, ‘ If the gospel be obscure,’ or rather hid, for it is a light, *obscure it cannot be, God forgive me if I used that speech, save only in our adversaries’ persons*, ‘ it is hid only to such as have the eyes of their mind blinded by Satan the God of this world.’ (2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.)” (ch. 7.)

I will only add two more passages on this point, occurring in the next section. “ Our Saviour saw well how earnestly the Jews were set to pervert Scriptures for their purpose, how glad to find any pretence out of them either to justify their dislike of his doctrine, or wreak their malice upon his person. . . . Yet doth not our Saviour accuse the Scriptures, though capable of so grievous and dangerous misconstruction, of obscurity or difficulty, or of being any way the occasion of Jewish heresy, or his persecution thence caused; nor doth he dissuade those very men which had thence sucked this poisonous doctrine, much less others, from reading, but exhorts them in truth and deed, not in word and fancy only, to rely on Scriptures as the rule of salvation. ‘ Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think,’ and that rightly, ‘ to have eternal life.’ Not intimating the least necessity of any external authority infallibly to direct them, he plainly teacheth it was the infernal distorture of their proud affections which had disproportioned their minds to this straight rule, and disenabled them for attaining true belief, which never can be rightly raised but by this square and line. It was not, then, the reading of Scriptures which caused them mistake their meaning and persecute him, but the not reading of them as they should. Err they did, not knowing the Scriptures, and know them

they did not, because they did not read them thoroughly, sincerely, searching out their inward meaning. And thus, to read them afresh, as our Saviour prescribed them, laying aside ambitious desires, was the only remedy for to cure that distemper which they had incurred by reading them amiss." (Sect 3. c. 5.) "They [i. e. the Romanists] except against Scripture, and say it cannot be the rule of faith, nor ought to be so taken of all Christians, because it is so obscure and apt to breed contentions among such as rely upon it. We have sufficiently proved that all obscurities, all contentions about the sense of Scriptures in points of moment arise hence, *Because* [sic] we do not admit of it for our only rule, all affection to men's persons, state, or dignity, all private quarrels laid apart. If the Jesuit could prove it should either continue obscure in points of faith, or minister matter of contention to such as conform their lives to the elementary rules or easy precepts therein contained, their arguments were to some purpose. But while this they neither can nor go about to prove, they shall only prove themselves ridiculous atheists, albeit we grant them all they desire about the variety of opinions even in places of greatest moment among the learned." (Sect. 3. ch. 6.)

As it respects the *fifth* point, or the authority upon which we receive the Scriptures as the word of God, his sentiments may be judged of from the following extracts.

This point forms the chief subject of his first book on the Creed, and his views may be inferred from the very title of his first two books, which is, "The Eternal Truth of Scriptures and Christian belief thereon wholly depending, manifested by its own light." "The grounds or motions," he says, "of our assent unto objects supernatural may be comprised in these four propositions following, The *first*, The stile or title of these sacred books pretending divine authority, bind all men to make trial of their truth, commended to us by our ancestors, confirmed to them by the blood of martyrs their predecessors; to use the means which they prescribe for this trial, that is,

abstinence from things forbidden, and alacrity in doing things commanded by them. The *second*, Ordinary apprehension or natural belief of matters contained in Scriptures, or the Christian Creed, are of more force to cause men undertake any good, or abstain from any evil, than the most firm belief of ordinary matters or any points of mere natural consequence. The *third*, Objects and grounds of Christian belief have in them greater stability of truth, and are in themselves more apt to found most strong and firm belief than any other things whatsoever merely credible. The *fourth*, The means of apprehending the truth of Scriptures, and *experiments confirming their divine authority*, are both for variety of kinds and number of individuals in every kind, far more, and more certain, than the means of apprehending the grounds of any other belief or the experiments of any other teacher's authority. Some particulars of every kind, with the general heads or common places whence like observations may be drawn, we are now to present, so far as they concern the confirmation of the truth of Scriptures in general."¹

Proceeding then to point out "the experiments confirming the truth of Scriptures," he says, "all may be reduced into these two general heads or kinds; they may be found *either* in the style or character of these writings themselves, the affections or dispositions of their writers, *or* in events or experiments, whatsoever the course of time affords, answerable to the rules set down in Scriptures." Of the former kind he notices "the historical characters of sacred antiquities," "the harmony of sacred writers," "the affections or dispositions of sacred writers;" and then proceeds to point out at considerable length "the experiments and observations answerable to the rules of Scriptures," proving them to be what they profess to be; which he prefaces with the observation that, "The means of *establishing* our assent unto any part of Scripture must be from experiments and observations, agreeable to the rules in Scripture. For when we see

¹ Bk. 1. P. 1. sect. 2. c. 2.

the reason and manner of sundry events, either related by others or experienced in ourselves, which otherwise we could never have reached unto by any natural skill; or generally, when we see any effects or concurrence of things which cannot be ascribed to any but a supernatural cause, and yet they fully agreeing to the oracles of Scriptures or Articles of belief, this is a sure pledge unto us that he who is the Author of truth, and gives being unto all things, was the Author of Scriptures.”¹

And having in the 2nd and 3rd sections treated of the experiments and observations *external*, drawn partly from heathen fables, partly from the revolution of states, or God’s public judgments, especially of the Jews, all testifying the truth of the divine oracles, he treats in the 4th, “Of experiments *in ourselves*, and the right framing of belief as well unto the several parts as unto the whole canon of Scripture;” and these experiments he calls “*the surest pledges* of divine truths, without which all observations of former experiments are but like assurances well drawn but never sealed.”

And the only notices of Church-tradition in this book are *indirect allusions* to it as offering a partial and introductory motive to the belief of Scripture as the word of God, which of course no one denies it to be, nor that it is one of a powerful kind.

I pass on to the learned

ARCHBISHOP USHER.

The extract given by Mr. Keble is taken from his Sermon, “Of the universality of the Church of Christ.” Now the only passage in it that gives even a semblance of support to Mr. Keble’s views is where the Archbishop says, “That which in the time of the antient Fathers was accounted to be ‘truly and properly catholic,’ namely, ‘that which was believed everywhere, always, and by all,’ that in the succeeding ages hath evermore been preserved, and is at this day entirely professed in our

¹ Bk. 1. P. 2. sect. 2. c. 1.

Church." The remark (though placed by Mr. Keble immediately after a sentence preceding it by some pages, without any indication of matter intervening) is made in reply to the popular question of the Romanist, "Where was your Church before Luther?" To which Usher replies,—“Our Church was even there where now it is. In all places of the world where the antient foundations were retained and these common principles of faith upon the profession whereof men have ever been wont to be admitted by baptism into the Church of Christ, there we doubt not but our Lord had his subjects, and we our fellow-servants. For we bring in *no new faith*, nor *no new church*. That which in the time of the antient Fathers,” &c. The passage therefore seems clearly to apply only to the “common principles of faith, upon the profession whereof men have ever been wont to be admitted by baptism into the Church of Christ;” that is, those articles of the Creed that have been admitted, as far as we can find, by all Churches. And further, we must inquire whether the archbishop held this “consent” to be so ascertainable in the strict sense of the term, as to be a divine or practically infallible informant, either as perpetuating the oral teaching of the Apostles, or from the promises of Christ to the Church, and thus to form part of the rule of faith. For as we have already observed, the Rule of Vincent is, in a general sense, and to a certain extent, applicable and useful; and hence is often referred to by those whose views were widely different to those of our opponents.

For the answer to this question, then, I refer the reader to the following extracts from his works.

As it respects the *first* point of the system under review, we read in him thus.

“That traditions of men should be obtruded unto us for articles of religion, and admitted for parts of God’s worship, or that *ANY traditions should be accepted for parcels of God’s word beside the holy Scriptures, and such doctrines as are either expressly therein contained, or by sound in-*

ference may be deduced from thence, I think we have reason to gainsay, as long as for the first we have this direct sentence from God himself, Matt. xv. In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, and for the second the express warrant of the Apostle, 2 Tim. iv. testifying of the Holy Scriptures, not only that *they are able to make us wise unto salvation*, which they should not be able to do if they did not contain all things necessary to salvation, but also that by them *the man of God*, that is the minister of God's word (1 Tim. vi. 11), unto whom it appertaineth *to declare all the counsel of God* (Acts xx. 27), may be *perfectly instructed to every good work*; which could not be, if the Scriptures did not contain all the counsel of God, which was fit for him to learn, or, *if there were any other word of God* which he were bound to teach that should not be contained within the limits of the Book of God." ¹

So in his "Body of Divinity, or the Sum and Substance of Christian Religion," in reply to the question, "Where, then, is the word of God now certainly to be learned?" he says, "*Only out of the Book of God, contained in the Holy Scriptures, which are the only certain testimonies unto the Church of the word of God.* John v. 39, 2 Tim. iii. 15." ²

For the *second* and *third* positions the reader may observe the following.

"The ground of our religion and the rule of faith, and all saving truth, is the word of God contained in the holy Scripture." ³

Again; in his Answer to the Jesuit, having intimated his desire that the points in difference should be determined by an appeal to the Scriptures, he adds, "And this we say, not as if we feared that these men were able to produce better proofs out of the writings of the Fathers

¹ Answer to Jesuit's Chall. ch. 2. 4th. ed. 1686. p. 24.

² Article 1.

³ Article 1 of the Irish Articles of 1615, known to have been drawn up by Usher.

for the part of the Pope, than we can do for the catholic cause, (when we come to join in the particulars, they shall find it otherwise,) but partly to bring the matter unto a shorter trial, partly to give the word of God his due, and to declare what *that rock* is upon which ALONE we *build our faith*, even ‘the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets’ (Eph. ii. 20); from which no sleight that they can devise shall ever draw us. The same course did St. Augustine take with the Pelagians; against whom he wanted not the authority of the Fathers of the Church, ‘which if I would collect,’ saith he, ‘and use their testimonies, it would be too long a work, and *I might peradventure seem to have less confidence than I ought in the canonical authorities from which we ought not to be withdrawn.*’ (Aug. De Nupt. et Concup. lib. ii. c. 29.) Yet was the Pelagian heresy then but newly budded; which is the time wherein the pressing of the Fathers’ testimonies is thought to be best in season. With how much better warrant may we follow this precedent, having to deal with such as have had time and leisure enough to falsify the Fathers’ writings, and to ‘teach them the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans!’”¹

“The books of Holy Scripture are so sufficient for the knowledge of Christian religion, that they do most plentifully contain all doctrine necessary to salvation. They being *perfectly profitable to instruct to salvation in themselves*, and all other imperfectly profitable thereunto, further than they draw from them. *Whence it followeth that we need no unwritten verities, no traditions or inventions of men, no canons of Councils, no sentences of Fathers, much less Decrees of Popes, for to supply any supposed defect of the written word, or for to give us a more perfect direction in the worship of God and the way of life than is already expressed in the Canonical Scriptures.* Matt. xxiii. 8. John v. 39. Matt. xv. 9. Finally, these Holy Scriptures are the Rule, the Line, the Square, and Light, whereby to examine and try all judgments and sayings of

¹ Ch. 1. pp. 7, 8.

men and angels. John xii. 48. Gal. i. 9. *All traditions, revelations, decrees of Councils, opinions of doctors, &c.,* are to be embraced so far forth as they may be *proved out of the Divine Scriptures, and not otherwise.* So that from them only all doctrine concerning our salvation must be drawn and derived. Where do you find that the Scriptures are able to *instruct us perfectly unto salvation?* The Apostle Paul in 2 Tim. iii. 15. doth expressly affirm it; and the reasons which may be gathered out of the two verses following do plainly prove it. What are these reasons? 1. God being author of these books, they must needs be perfect as he himself is. Who being for his wisdom able, and for his love to his Church willing, to set down such a rule as may guide them to eternal life, hath not failed herein. 2. They are profitable to *teach* all true doctrine, and to confute the false; to correct all disorder, private and public, and to inform men in the way of righteousness. 3. The man of God, that is, the Preacher and Minister of the Word, is thereby made complete and perfect, sufficiently furnished unto every good work or duty of the ministry. How doth this last reason hold? Most strongly. For the people being to learn of the minister, what to believe and what to do, and more being required of him that must be the eye and mouth of all the rest, if *he* may be perfectly instructed by the Scriptures, they are much more able to *give every common man sufficient instruction.*"¹

"What assurance may be had of the right understanding the Holy Scriptures? For the words, it is to be had out of the original text, or translations of the same; *for the sense or meaning, ONLY OUT OF THE SCRIPTURES THEMSELVES,* (Nehem. viii. 8.) *which by places plain and evident do express whatsoever is obscure and hard touching matters necessary to eternal salvation.*"—"Why must the true sense or meaning of the Scriptures be learned out of the Scriptures themselves? Because *the Spirit of God alone*

¹ Body of Div. Art. 1.

is the certain Interpreter of his word written by his Spirit. For no man knoweth the things pertaining to God but the Spirit of God. (1 Cor. ii. 11.) And no prophecy of Scripture is of man's own interpretation; for prophecy was not brought by the will of men, but the holy men of God spake as they were led by the Holy Ghost. (2 Pet. i. 20, 21.) The interpretation, therefore, must be by the same Spirit by which the Scripture was written; of which Spirit we have no certainty upon any man's credit, but only so far forth as his saying may be confirmed by the Holy Scripture. What gather you from hence? That no interpretation of Holy Fathers, Popes, Councils, *custom or practice of the Church*, either contrary to the manifest words of the Scripture, or *containing matters which cannot NECESSARILY be proved out of the Scriptures*, are to be received as an undoubted truth. How, then, is Scripture to be interpreted by Scripture? According to the analogy of faith, (Rom. xii. 6.), and the scope and circumstances of the present place, and conference of other plain and evident places, by which all such as are obscure and hard to be understood ought to be interpreted. *For there is no matter necessary to eternal life which is not PLAINLY AND SUFFICIENTLY SET FORTH IN MANY PLACES OF SCRIPTURE, by which other places that are abused by the devil or his ministers may be interpreted.* As our Saviour Christ giveth us example, (Matt. iv. 6, 7.) when the devil abused the text of Scripture, (Ps. xci. 11.) declaring that this place must be so understood as it may agree with that most evident and express commandment written in Deut. vi. 16. 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'"¹

In these passages, let us observe, Scripture is set forth not only as *full and explicit* in the doctrines it delivers, but as *the only source of all the truths of religion*, for he says that "we need no unwritten verities, no traditions, &c. for to supply any supposed defect of the written

¹ Ib.

word, or for to give us a *more perfect direction in the worship of God* and the way of life, than is already expressed in the canonical Scriptures . . . from them only all doctrine CONCERNING *our salvation* must be drawn and derived. And that in this passage he meant to include not merely necessary and fundamental points, but *all* the truths of religion, is evident from the following passage, which follows soon after that just quoted ;—“ Our adversaries quarrel against this most rich and plentiful treasure of the Holy Scriptures, alleging that we receive many things by tradition which are not in Scripture, and yet we believe them. As Mary’s perpetual virginity and the baptism of infants. We make not Mary’s perpetual virginity *any matter of religion*. . . . As for baptism of infants, it is sufficiently warranted by reasons of Scripture, though not by example.”¹

I proceed to the *fourth* position, on which, however, the passages already quoted might be a sufficient testimony ; especially where he says,—“ *There is no matter necessary to eternal life which is not plainly and sufficiently set forth in many places of Scripture.*”

I will, however, add the following, as further proofs of his mind on this important point.

“ They [i. e. the Scriptures] are as a rule of steel that is firm and changeth not. (Matt. v. 18. Ps. xix. 9.) For seeing they are sufficient to make us *wise unto salvation*, as is before proved, it followeth of necessity, that there is a most certain rule of truth for instruction both of *faith and works*, to be learned out of them by ordinary means of reading, prayer, study, the gifts of tongues, and other sciences, to which God promiseth the assistance of his grace. (John v. 39. James i. 5.) And this sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God written, as the example of Christ our General Captain showeth, (Matt. iv.) is delivered unto us by the Holy Ghost, both to defend our faith and to overcome all our spiritual enemies, which are the devil and his instruments, false prophets, heretics,

¹ Body of Div. Art. 1.

schismatics, and such like. (Eph. vi. 12.)"—“Are the Scriptures, then, plain and easy to be understood? There are some hard things in the Scriptures, that have proper relation to the time in which the Scripture was written and uttered, or which are prophecies of things to be fulfilled hereafter, which if we never understand, we shall be never the worse for the attaining of everlasting salvation. There are other things in Scripture belonging unto the saving knowledge of God; all which are dark and difficult unto those whose eyes the god of this world hath blinded. (2 Cor. iv. 4. 2 Pet. iii. 5. John viii. 43.) But unto such as are by grace enlightened and made willing to understand, (Ps. cxix. 18.), howsoever some things remain obscure (2 Pet. iii. 16.) to exercise their diligence, yet *the fundamental doctrines of faith and precepts of life are all plain and perspicuous.* FOR ALL DOCTRINE NECESSARY TO BE KNOWN UNTO ETERNAL SALVATION IS SET FORTH IN THE SCRIPTURES MOST CLEARLY AND PLAINLY, EVEN TO THE CAPACITY AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE SIMPLE AND UNLEARNED.” “But here the Papists have many things to object against you, to prove that the Scriptures are dark and hard to be understood: and, Object. 1., First, That the matters contained in them are divine, high, and beyond man’s reason, as the Trinity, the Creation of nothing, &c. These matters indeed are above human reason, and therefore are we to bring faith to believe them, not human reason to comprehend them. But they are *delivered in Scripture in as plain terms as such matter can be.* Object. 2. Peter saith, That some things in Paul’s Epistles are hard, and wrested by unlearned and unstable men. (2 Pet. iii. 16.) First, he saith not that all Paul’s Epistles are hard, but something in them, which we grant. Secondly, They are the wicked and unsettled in knowledge that wrest them, as gluttons and drunkards abuse meat and drink. Object. 3. If the Scriptures were not dark, what need so many commentaries upon them? And why are they so full of parables and allegories as they are? THE WHOLE DOCTRINE OF

SALVATION IS TO BE FOUND SO PLAIN THAT IT NEEDETH NO COMMENTARY. And commentaries are for other places that are dark, and also to make more large use of Scripture than a new beginner can make of himself, which we see necessary in all human arts and sciences. Further, though the speech of Scripture seem hard at first, yet by custom it becometh easy, as reading doth to children. Object. 4. The godly eunuch saith, he could not understand the Scripture without an interpreter. (Acts viii. 31.) Though he understood not some dark places, yet that hindered him not from reading plainer places. Object. 5. The multitude of learned men that fall into heresies, which they labour to confirm by Scripture, proveth that the Scripture is dark. It is their naughty hearts, that come not with an humble and godly affection, that maketh them do so. Object. 6. But we see by experience that there are many that daily read the Scriptures, and yet understand not the thousandth part of them. They read them not with care and conscience, with prayer and study, but like the women that are always learning and never come to the knowledge of the truth. (2 Tim. iii. 7.) Object. 7. If the Scriptures be so plain and perspicuous, what need is there then of an interpreter? First to unfold obscure places. (Acts viii. 31.) Secondly, to inculcate and apply plain texts. (2 Pet. i. 12, 13. 1 Cor. xiv. 3.)”¹

“ Although there be some hard things in the Scripture, especially such as have proper relation to the times in which they were first uttered, and prophecies of things which were afterwards to be fulfilled, yet all things necessary to be known unto everlasting salvation, are *clearly delivered therein*; and nothing of that kind is spoken under dark mysteries in one place which is not in other places spoken more familiarly and plainly, *to the capacity both of learned and unlearned.*”²

“ The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, AND *are able to instruct sufficiently in all points*

¹ Body of Div. Art. 1.

² Irish Articles, Art. 5.

*of faith that we are bound to believe, and all good duties that we are bound to practise.”*¹

I proceed to the *fifth* position, respecting which we have the following testimony.

“How may it appear that this book, which you call the Book of God and the Holy Scripture, is the word of God indeed, and not men’s policies? By the constant testimony of men in all ages, from them that first knew these penmen of the Holy Ghost, with their writings, until our time; *AND reasons taken out of the works themselves agreeable to the quality of the writers.* Both which kinds of arguments the Holy Scriptures have as much and far more than any other writings. Wherefore, as it were extreme impudency to deny the works of Homer, Plato, Virgil, Tully, Livy, Galen, and such like, which the consent of all ages has received and delivered unto us, which *also* by the tongue, phrase, matter, and all other circumstances agreeable, are confirmed to be the works of the same authors whose they are testified to be; so it were more than brutish madness to doubt of the certain truth and authority of the Holy Scriptures, which no less but much more than any other writings for their authors, are testified and confirmed to be the sacred word of the ever-living God. *Not only* testified, I say, by the uniform witness of men in all ages, *but also* confirmed by such reasons *taken out of the writings themselves*, as do sufficiently argue the Spirit of God to be the Author of them. For we may learn out of the testimonies themselves, as David did, Ps. cxix. 152, that God hath established them for ever.—Let me hear some of those reasons which prove that God is the Author of the Holy Scriptures. First, the true godliness and holiness wherewith the writers of the Scriptures shined as lamps in their times, and far surpassed all men of other religions. . . . 2. The simplicity, integrity, and sincerity of these writers in matters that concern themselves, and those that belong unto them. . . . 3. The quality and condi-

¹ Ib. Art. 6.

tion of the penmen of these holy writings. . . . 4. The matter of the Holy Scripture being altogether of heavenly doctrine. . . . 5. The doctrine of the Scripture is such as could never breed in the brains of man. . . . 6. The sweet concord between these writings. . . . 7. A continuance of wonderful prophecies, foretelling things to come so long before. . . . 8. The great majesty full of heavenly wisdom and authority. . . . 9. In speaking of matters of the highest nature, they go not about to persuade men by reasons as philosophers and orators, but absolutely require credit to be given to them because the Lord hath spoken it. . . . 10. The end and scope of the Scriptures is for the advancement of God's glory and the salvation of man's soul. . . . 11. The admirable power and force that is in them to convert and alter men's minds. . . . 12. The Scriptures, as experience sheweth, have the power of God in them. . . . 13. The writers of the Holy Scriptures are the most antient of all others. . . . 14. The deadly hatred that the devil and all wicked men carry against the Scriptures. . . . 15. The marvellous preservation of the Scriptures. . . . —Show now how the Holy Scriptures have the consonant testimony of men of all times since they were written, that they are the most holy word of God. . . . [where, having spoken of the testimony borne to Moses by Joshua, and the testimony of other writers of the Old Testament to their predecessors in the Canon, he adds], Finally, from that time [i. e. the time of Malachi] the Church of the Jews, until the coming of Christ in the flesh, embraced all the former writings of the prophets as the book of God. Christ himself appealeth unto them as a sufficient testimony of him. John v. 39. The Apostles and Evangelists prove the writings of the New Testament by them; and the Catholic Church of Christ from the Apostles' time unto this day, hath acknowledged all the said writings, both of the Old and New Testament, to be the undoubted word of God. Thus have we the testimony both of the Old Church of the Jews, God's pecu-

liar people and first-born, to whom the oracles of God were committed, (Acts vii. 38. Hos. viii. 12. Rom. iii. 2. and ix. 4.) and the New of Christians, together with the general account which all the godly at all times have made of the Scriptures, when they have crossed their natures and courses, as accounting it in their souls to be of God; and the special testimony of martyrs, who have sealed the certainty of the same by shedding their blood for them. Hereunto also may be added the testimony of those which are out of the Church, heathens, out of whom many antient testimonies are cited to this purpose by Josephus contra Appion., Turks, Jews, who to this day acknowledge all the books of the Old Testament, and heretics who labour to shroud themselves under them, &c. —Are there not some divine testimonies which may likewise be added to these? Yes; First, the known miracles, which the devil was never able to do, that did so often follow the writers and teachers of the Scriptures. Secondly, the manifold punishments and destruction of those that have reviled and persecuted the same.—Are these motives of themselves sufficient to work saving faith, and persuade us fully to rest in God's word? No; Besides all these, it is required, that we have the Spirit of God as well to open our eyes to see the light, as to seal up fully unto our hearts that truth which we see with our eyes. For the same Holy Spirit that inspired the Scriptures, inclineth the hearts of God's children to believe what is revealed in them, *and inwardly assureth them, above all reasons and arguments, that these are the Scriptures of God.* Therefore the Lord, by the prophet Isaiah, promiseth to join his Spirit with his word, and that it shall remain with his children for ever. Isa. lix. 21. The same promiseth our Saviour Christ unto his disciples concerning the Comforter, which he would send to lead them into all truth, to teach them all things, and to put them in mind of all things which he had said unto them. John xiv. 26. and xv. 26. and xvi. 23. The Lord, by the prophet Jeremiah, also promiseth to give his law into their minds, and

to write it in the hearts of his people. Jer. xxxi. 33. And St. John saith to the faithful, that by the anointing of the Holy Spirit which is on them, they know all things. 1 John ii. 20. *This testimony of God's Spirit in the hearts of his faithful, as it is proper to the word of God, so is it greater than any human persuasions grounded upon reason or witnesses of men.*—"They [i. e. the Papists] object that it is by tradition and not by Scripture that we know such and such books to be Scripture. Though new beginners do first learn it from the faithful, yet afterwards they know it upon grounds of Scripture. As an ignorant man may be told of the king's coin, but it is not that telling but the king's stamp that maketh it current and good coin."¹

I proceed to

BISHOP TAYLOR.

To the testimony of this learned and able Prelate, Mr. Keble justly attaches much importance; and therefore, besides the extract from him in the "Catena," he is quoted at some length in the Postscript to the Sermon,² and claimed as a supporter of the system under review. Where lies the force of the passage in the "Catena" to prove the truth of Mr. Keble's views, I confess I cannot see. Nay, in that passage (taken from the Dissuasive from Popery, Pt. 1. bk. 1. § 1.) the bishop says,—"*To these [i. e. the Scriptures] we also add, not as authors or finishers, but as helpers of our faith, and heirs of the doctrine apostolical, the sentiments and catholic doctrine of the Church of God in the ages next after the Apostles.*" "*Any number that is less than all, does not prove a catholic consent.*" "We do easily acknowledge that to dispute these questions from the sayings of the Fathers, is not the readiest way to make an end of them; but therefore we do *wholly rely* upon Scriptures as the foundation and final resort of all our persuasions, and from thence can never be confuted; but we also admit the Fathers as admirable *helps*

¹ Body of Div. Art. 1.

² See pp. 68—73, and 80, 81.

for the understanding of the Scriptures, and as good testimony of the doctrine delivered from their forefathers down to them, of what the Church esteemed the way of salvation ; and therefore *if we find any doctrine now taught which was not placed in their way of salvation, we reject it as being no part of the Christian faith, and which ought not to be imposed upon consciences*”—i. e. in vital points, he admits the testimonies of the Fathers *negatively*, as proof *against novel doctrines*.

True, he says,—“ It is not easy to find a better [sword to combat the errors of the Romanists] than the word of God, expounded by the prime and best antiquity.” But this proves nothing more than that the bishop held that the expositions of that antiquity, the authority of which the Romanists acknowledged, were good arguments for their confutation. For his own views as to their use or authority, we must look further ; and we find them abundantly manifested in the very work from which this extract is taken.

Before, however, we proceed to the passages we are about to quote, there are some extracts in the Postscript of the Sermon to be considered, and particularly an alleged change of views in Bishop Taylor on this matter.

In his “ Liberty of Prophesying,” published in 1647, and republished by the author in 1657, and his “ Ductor Dubitantium,” or Rule of Conscience, published in 1660, only seven years before his death, there are some passages admitted to be very inconsistent with the views of the Tractators. It appears, however, that in a sermon to his clergy between 1660 and 1664, there are some passages supposed to be favourable to them ; and accordingly Mr. Keble intimates that his views underwent a change on these points at that time ; and Bishop Jebb (as quoted by Mr. Keble) hesitates not to say, “ Vincentius’ rule . . . has been unreservedly acknowledged as a just and true guide by Bishop Taylor, in one of his latest works, his Visitation Sermon at Connor ; a tribute this last the more remarkable, because, in his *Liberty of Prophesying*, and

in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, he had spoken less respectfully of the principle; and his remarkable change of language can be accounted for only by his having undergone a correspondent change of sentiment. *He had seen, felt, and weighed every difficulty; the result of all was a deliberate persuasion that Vincentius was right, and that he himself had been wrong.*"²

Now it must at once strike the reader as not a little extraordinary, that such a change should have taken place in such a case. And before the assertion was ventured that Bishop Taylor had changed his mind in a matter of such moment, and one in which he had repeatedly stated his views, in very clear and strong language, and that, in his greatest and most elaborate work, the "*Ductor Dubitantium*," it would have been well to have referred to his *last* work, viz. the Second Part of the Dissuasive from Popery, which was passing through the press at the time of his death in 1667, and published shortly after. Would not any ordinary reader suppose that there was no testimony subsequent to that sermon, by which the views of Bishop Taylor could be ascertained? And is it fair thus to keep back part of the case? And with the existence of this work Mr. Keble is well acquainted; for, as we have seen, the extract in his *Catena* is taken from the first part of it.

I commend the following passage from that work to the attention of the reader. "I shall now," he says, "represent the uncertainty and fallibility of the pretence of traditions in ordinary, and the certain deceptions of those who trust them, and the impossibility of ending many questions by them. . . . This topic of pretended tradition is the most fallible thing in the world. . . . Add to this, that the world is not agreed about the competency of the testimony, or what is sufficient to prove tradition to be apostolical. Some require and allow only the testimony of the present Catholic Church, to prove a tradition. . . . But there is a better way; Vincentius

² Lett. 53. Forster's Life, ii. 249.

Lirinensis's way of judging a traditional doctrine to be apostolical and divine, is 'the consent of all Churches and all ages.' It is something less than St. Austin requires (*Lib. de doctr. Christiana*, c. 8.) . . . He speaks it of the particular of judging what books are canonical; in which, as tradition is the way to judge, so the rule of tradition is 'the consent of most of the Catholic Churches, particularly those places where the Apostles did sit, and to which the Apostles did write.' . . . This way of St. Austin is of great and approved use in the knowing what books are canonical; and in these things it can be had, in some more, in some less, in all more than can be said against it; and there is nothing in succeeding times to give a check to our assent in their degrees, because the longer the succession runs, still the more the Church was established in it. But yet concerning those books of Scripture, of which it was long doubted in the Church whether they were part of the Apostolical Canon of Scripture, there ought to be no pretence that they were delivered for such by the Apostles; at least not by those Churches who doubted of them . . . the consequent will be that TRADITION IS AN UNCERTAIN THING; and if it cannot be entire and full in assigning *the Canon of Scripture*, it is *hardly to be trusted for anything else which consists of words subject to divers interpretations*. But, in other things, it may be, the case is not so; for we find that, in divers particulars, to prove a point to be a tradition apostolical, use is made of the testimony of the three first ages. *Indeed, these are the likeliest to know; but yet they have told us of some things to be traditions, which we have no reason to believe to be such.* ONLY THUS FAR THEY ARE USEFUL; if they never reported a doctrine, it is the less likely to descend from the Apostles; and if the order of succession be broken anywhere, the succeeding ages can never be surer. If they speak against a doctrine, as, for example, against the half communion, we are sure it was no tradition apostolical; if they speak not at all of it, we can never prove the tradition; for it

may have come in since that time, and yet come to be thought or called 'tradition apostolical' from other causes, of which I have given account. AND, INDEED, THERE IS NO SECURITY SUFFICIENT, BUT THAT WHICH CAN NEVER BE HAD, AND THAT IS THE UNIVERSAL POSITIVE TESTIMONY OF ALL THE CHURCH OF CHRIST; which [adds Bishop Taylor, applying these GENERAL remarks on *tradition in the abstract*, to the *particular* case with which he was then dealing,] he that looks for in the disputed traditions, pretended by the Church of Rome, may look as long as the Jews do for their wrong Messias. So much as this is, can never be had; and less than this, will never do it."¹

This is but one of many similar passages in this work, some of which I shall adduce presently; but this alone may, I think, be allowed to decide the question as to Bishop Taylor's alleged change of views in this matter, as far as points of faith are concerned. The fact is, it is only necessary to *put together* what he has said in his "Ductor Dubitantium" on this point, and observe his whole mind upon it, to see that in all that he has said respecting it in these various works, *at least* as far as concerns *points of faith*, he has taken precisely the same ground.

It will be observed that in the passage just quoted from the Second Part of the Dissuasive, Bishop Taylor allows the usefulness of Church tradition, (1) in its testimony respecting the Canon of Scripture, (though widely differing from our opponents as to the extent of that usefulness;) and also (2) *negatively* as to doctrines, i. e., that its absence throws suspicion on a doctrine, and its opposition is sufficient to condemn it; and in the next chapter he admits (3) the authority of the Creed, as an Apostolical tradition, on the testimony of the early Church. Now this is precisely the ground he had taken in his "Ductor Dubitantium;" where he says, as it respects the *first*, "The next inquiry is, What use there is of traditions; and if they cannot be a part of the rule, what aids do they bring to

¹ Diss. from Pop. Pt. 2. Bk. 1. Sect. 3. § 6. Works, x. 441—51.

the conscience in faith or manners? To this I answer, that tradition is of great use for the conveying of this great rule of conscience, the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.”¹ Proceeding, a little further on, to the consideration of the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, he says, (2), “If we begin to account by this rule of Vincentius, and go backwards, it is nothing, unless we go back as far as to the Apostles inclusively; but if we begin there, and make that clear, it matters not how little a way it descends; and, therefore, although it is *an excellent rule to reprove vain and novel pretensions*, yet there is nothing to be *proved by it* practicably.”² Again, “The third rule is, ‘Whatsoever the Catholic Church hath kept in all ages by-gone, may rightly be believed to have descended from the Apostles, though it be such a thing which might have been instituted by the Church.’ This rule is the same with that of Lirinensis, of which I have already given account; and certainly in those things in which it can be made use of, which are extremely few, it is *the best, and, indeed, the only good one*. But then *this can relate only to rituals, not to matter of doctrine*. . . . By this rule the distinction of Bishops and Presbyters is an Apostolical tradition, besides the Scriptures, by which it appears to be divine; by this the consecration of the blessed Eucharist by ecclesiastical persons, bishops and priests, is certainly a tradition Apostolical; by this the Lord’s Day is derived to us from the Apostles; and by this the baptism of infants is much confirmed unto the Church; and whatsoever can descend to us, and be observed in this channel, there is no sufficient reason to deny it to be Apostolical.”³ And then (3) further on, coming to the consideration of the Apostles’ Creed, he says, after having quoted the testimonies of the Fathers respecting it, “Since, as Sixtus Senensis says, that ‘All the orthodox Fathers affirm the Creed to be made by the Apostles;’ and they all say this is a sufficient rule of faith for all

¹ Bk. ii. ch. 3. Rule 14. vol. xiii. p. 114.

² Ib. p. 131.

³ Ib. p. 138.

Christians; here we ought to rest our heads and our hearts, and not to intricate our faith by more questions.' ¹ How far he is correct on this last point, the reader may judge from the testimonies in c. 4 above. The statement of Sixtus Senensis appears to have been too much relied upon by him.

Now in the sermon from which Mr. Keble quotes, and to which Bishop Jebb refers, as indicating a change of views respecting the value of Church-tradition, the Bishop says, "Next to this analogy or proportion of faith, let the consent of the Catholic Church be your measure, so as by no means to prevaricate in any doctrine in which all Christians always have consented. This will appear to be a necessary rule by-and-bye; but in the mean time I shall observe to you that it will be the safer, because it CANNOT GO FAR; it can be instanced BUT IN THREE THINGS, in THE CREED, in ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT, and in EXTERNAL FORMS OF WORSHIP AND LITURGY." And then he proceeds to enumerate some of the more important *points of ecclesiastical government, and forms of worship and liturgy*, in which "all Christians ever have consented," as the observation of the Lord's Day, episcopacy, baptism, &c. Now here the allowance of Vincentius's rule is just in those points, and in those points only, in which it was allowed in the "*Ductor Dubitantium*," i. e. in the Creed and in rituals, in matters which the Church hath always *practised*, and the very same instances, viz. episcopacy, baptism, &c. are given in both cases; to which no doubt, had his subject led him to it in the sermon, he would have added, as in the other treatises, the use of tradition for conveying the Canon of Scripture, and *negatively* in matters of faith.

Consequently, as it respects matters of faith, there is no evidence, in his sermon, of any change of mind as to the application or value of the rule of Vincentius; and further, there is evidence, from his very last work, the *Second Part of the Dissuasive from Popery*, that there was no such change.

¹ Ib. p. 168.

And I will here add another passage in proof of this, from the same work, i. e. the Second Part of the Dissuasive.

“ But to come closer to the thing ; Suppose tradition of *fact* to be certain, for so it is in many instances, and if it be universal, it will be allowed to be so in all ; yet it is but *so certain*, that yet there is a natural possibility that it should be false ; and it is possible that what the generality of one sort of men do jointly testify, may yet be found false, or at least uncertain ; as the burial of Mahomet in Mecca, and his being attracted by a loadstone, of which the Mahometans have a long and general tradition, at least we in Christendom are made to believe so ; and if it be not so, yet it is naturally possible that they should all believe and teach a lie, and they *actually do so* ; yet I will *allow ecclesiastical catholic tradition*, speaking morally, to be certain and indubitable ; and that if this should fail, much of our comfort and certainty of adherence to Christian religion would fail with it ; but then it is to be considered that THE CERTAINTY OF TRADITION, WHICH IS ALLOWED, IS BUT IN MATTERS OF FACT, NOT IN DOCTRINES ; because the fact may be one, the doctrines many ; that soon remembered, these soon forgotten ; *that perceived by sense, these mistaken and misunderstood* ; and though it is very credibly reported, and easily believed, that Julius Cæsar was killed in the senate, yet all that he said that day, and all the unwritten orders he made, and all his orations, will not, cannot so easily be trusted upon oral tradition. So that oral tradition is a good ministry of conveying a record, but it is not the best record ; and the principal office of oral tradition is done, when the record is verified by it, when the Scripture is consigned ; and though still it is useful, yet it is not still so necessary. . . . The effect of this discourse is this : That oral tradition may be very certain ; and, in some case, is the best evidence we have *in matters of fact*, unless where we are taught by sense or revelation ; and if it were not certain, we should be infinitely to seek for notices of things that are past ; but this is but a moral certainty, though it be

the best we have ; and THIS IS BUT IN MATTERS OF FACT, NOT IN DOCTRINES, OR ORATIONS, OR NOTIONS DELIVERED IN MANY WORDS ; and after all this, when tradition hath consigned an instrument or record, a writing or a book, it may then leave being necessary ; and when the providence of God undertakes to supply the testimony of man, the change is for our advantage.”¹

Nay, Mr. Keble himself tells us that Bishop Taylor’s view in this matter was, “that in practical matters it [i. e. tradition] may be verified ; but IN DOCTRINAL, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE CREED, IT CANNOT.” (p. 71.) This yields the whole question.

His notion respecting the Creed, that the testimony of the Fathers proves it to be an Apostolical composition, is of course opposed to that which I have maintained in the fourth chapter, where I have endeavoured to show that such a notion has no sufficient foundation to rest upon ; and that be the authority of the Fathers what it may, their testimony is not to be had for this point. But his notion in this matter touches not any of the main points of the system under review.

As it respects points of ecclesiastical polity, his language in the sermon may seem, *at first view*, stronger than might have been expected ; but upon consideration we shall, I think, find that there is no real inconsistency in his statements ; and that they are practically and essentially confirmatory of our views.

He says, in the “Ductor,” “Whatever can descend to us and be observed in this channel, [i. e. Church-tradition,] there is no sufficient reason to deny it to be Apostolical ; *but then how far it can be obligatory to all ages, and to all Churches, will be another consideration.*”² He here seems to admit, like some of the Fathers, that Church-tradition might be found for some rites, sufficient at least to render it probable that they had Apostolical sanction ; but then he thinks this insufficient to prove their perpetual obligation ; which practically makes the admission of little importance.

¹ Introd. vol. x, 280, 281.

² Vol. xiii. p. 139.

Now let us proceed to see how he speaks of the same matter in his *last* work, the second part of the Dissuasive. "That any or more of these [i. e. the Apostolical] Churches did or did not do so, *is no argument that such a custom came from the Apostles* ; or if it did, that it did *oblige succeeding ages*, unless this custom began by a *doctrine*, and that the tradition came from the Apostles with a declaration of its perpetual obligation ;" ¹ *and for the doctrine in such a case he tells us we must go to Scripture*. Thus as to the baptism of children he says, "The matter of fact is indifferent if abstracted from the doctrine. For at the first they did or they did not according as they pleased, for there is no pretence of tradition that the Church in all ages did baptize all the infants of Christian parents. . . . But then, if we consider the doctrine appendant to it . . . the proper reasons why the Church baptizes infants . . . are *wholly derived to us from Scripture grounds*." . . . "It was but weakly said by Cardinal Perron, that there is no place of Scripture by which we can *evidently and necessarily* convince the anabaptists. For . . . although the Anabaptists endeavour to elude the arguments of Scripture, yet it follows not that Scripture is not clear and certain in the article. . . . *If the Anabaptists speak probably and reasonably in their answers, then it will rather follow that the point is NOT NECESSARY, than that it must be proved necessary by some other topic. All people that believe baptism of infants necessary, think that they sufficiently prove it from Scripture ; and Bellarmine, though he also urges this point as an argument for tradition [as our opponents do], yet, upon wiser thoughts, he proves it, and not unsuccessfully, by three arguments from Scripture.*" ² "Although we are able to prove this [i. e. that two sacraments only are generally necessary to salvation] by a tradition much more universal than by which the Roman doctors can prove seven, yet we *rely upon Scripture for our doctrine.*" ³ Other similar passages might be added, particularly as to the

¹ x. 450.² x. 430—33.³ p. 438.

observance of the Lord's day.¹ So that even should it be admitted that Church-tradition may convey to us the knowledge of some apostolically-instituted rites and customs, yet he does not allow the authority of that Church-tradition to bind us to the observance of them, unless *the Scripture* clearly lays down a doctrine prescribing them as of *perpetual obligation*.

In this latter work, then, so far from having receded from his unfavourable opinion of tradition, he intimates that *the practice of the primitive Churches cannot even prove that a custom was derived from the Apostles*, and still more strongly maintains, that if it did, it did not oblige succeeding ages, unless it was grounded upon doctrine laid down in the Scriptures.

Now in the intermediate time between the writing of these two works, he says to his clergy, after mentioning the Lord's day, baptism, episcopacy, confirmation, public forms of prayer, &c. (the observation of which he elsewhere places upon scriptural grounds,) "He that shall prophesy or expound Scripture to *the prejudice* of any of these things, hath no part in that article of his creed, he does not believe the holy Catholic Church, he hath no fellowship, no communion with the saints and servants of God."²

I can see no opposition in this passage to his statements elsewhere. He does not put forward anything here on the ground of Apostolical tradition. All that he avers is, that such and such observances are enjoined in Scripture, and had been practised for centuries in (speaking generally) the universal Church, and consequently that he who interpreted Scripture contrary to them, was opposing himself to the whole Church. But this does not show that he did not throughout place the onus of proof for their *perpetual obligation* upon Scripture. At any rate, he did this in the last work he wrote, when his views were in their most mature state. And in this work he does not, like the Tractators, tell us that Scripture is so

¹ pp. 436, 7.

² Works, vi. p. 521.

obscure on these points that it needs tradition to unfold its meaning to us, and that the only ground upon which we can rest the correctness of our interpretation of the *brief and obscure notices* of Scripture respecting them, is the testimony of Church-tradition. No, he points to Scripture as delivering clearly to us all important points, as we shall see presently. And in his sermon to his clergy he seems evidently to have had in view more especially the *case of individuals* who attempted to prove from Scripture that such things were *unlawful*, and *separated* from the Church on account of them, whose presumption he justly rebukes, and guards his clergy against the influence of those domestic malcontents who might mislead them.

Viewing the different circumstances under which he was speaking, his statements appear to me easily reconcilable with one another. Will Mr. Keble, indeed, contend that he said one thing in 1660, another in 1664, and in 1667 went back to his views of 1660?

I must also add, that in his last work he gives some very useful remarks and stringent cautions as to the *admission* of pretended Apostolical traditions in rituals. "For aught appears to the contrary," he says, "many traditions were two or three hundred years old the first day they were born; and it is not easy to reckon by what means the Fathers came or might come to admit many things to be tradition; and themselves were not sure: therefore they made rules of their conjecture, presumptions, and sometimes weak arguments. It will be much more hard for us to tell which are right and which are wrong, who have nothing but their rules, which were then but conjectural, and are since proved in many instances to be improbable. Such is that rule of St. Austin, (*De bapt. contr. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24. and c. 6.*), 'Whatsoever was anciently received and not instituted, so far as men looking back may observe, by posterity, that is, not decreed by councils, may most rightly be believed to descend from Apostolical tradition,' [the

famous rule so often quoted]; that is, if we do not know the beginning of a universal custom, we may safely conclude it to be primitive and apostolic. Which kind of rule is something like what a witty gentleman said of an old man and an old woman in Ireland; that if they should agree to say that they were Adam and Eve, no man living could disprove them. . . . It is certain this rule is but a precarious pitiful presumption, since every antient custom that any succeeding age hath a mind to continue, may, for the credit of it, and the ignorance of the original, like new upstart gentlemen, be entitled to an honourable house. 'Every one believes the commandments of his ancestors to be traditions apostolical,' said St. Jerome; and that these came in by private authority, and yet obtained a public name, we have competent warranty from Tertullian, (*De Cor. Mil.* c. 4.) who justifies it thus far, 'Do you not think it lawful for every faithful man to appoint whatever he thinks may please God unto discipline and salvation?' And St. Irenæus tells (*ap. Euseb. lib. [V.] c. 26.*) that the variety of keeping Lent, which puts in strongly also to be an Apostolical tradition, began among his ancestors, 'who did not accurately observe their customs, who, by a certain simplicity or private authority, appointed anything for their posterity.' So that here it is apparent that every private man that was of an antient standing in the Church might introduce customs and usages which himself thought pious. And next it is also evident that when these customs derived from their ancestors happened to continue in a lasting use, their posterity was apt to call them traditions apostolical: according to Tertullian, who confessed this very thing. Thus things indifferent being esteemed useful or pious, became customary, and then came for reverence into a putative and usurped authority; but they who, having this warning from the very persons whence the mistake comes, will yet swallow the hook, deserve to live upon air and fancy, and to chew deceit. But this topic of pretended tradi-

tion is the most fallible thing in the world ; for it is discovered of some things that are called Apostolical tradition that they had their original of being so esteemed upon the authority and reputation of one man . . . the gospel of Nicodemus, so far as yet appears, was author of the pretended tradition of the signing with the sign of the cross at every motion of the body ; and led Tertullian and St. Basil, and in consequence the Churches of succeeding ages, into the practice of it. A little thing will draw on a willing mind ; and nothing is so credulous as piety and timorous religion ; and nothing was more fearful to displease God and curious to please him than the primitive Christians, and everything that would invite them to what they thought pious was sure to prevail ; and how many such pretences might enter in at this wide door, every man can easily observe.”¹

On this point, however, I shall not enlarge, but proceed at once to the passages more immediately relating to our present subject, which, to avoid all cavil, I shall take from Bishop Taylor’s last work, the second part of his *Disuasive*.

On the *first* point we have the following testimony.

“ That the Scripture is a full and sufficient rule to Christians in faith and manners, a full and perfect declaration of the will of God, is therefore certain, because we have no other. For if we consider the grounds upon which all Christians believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, the same grounds prove that *nothing else is*. . . A doctrine is neither more nor less the word of God for being written or unwritten ; that is but accidental and extrinsecal to it ; for it was first unwritten, and then the same thing was written : only when it was written it was better conserved and surer transmitted, and not easily altered, and more fitted to be a rule. And indeed *only can be so* : not but that every word of God is as much a rule as any word of God ; but we are sure that what is so written and so transmitted is God’s word, WHEREAS CON-

¹ Pt. 2. bk. 1. § 3. x. pp. 444—7.

CERNING OTHER THINGS WHICH WERE NOT WRITTEN, WE HAVE NO CERTAIN RECORDS, NO EVIDENT PROOF, NO SUFFICIENT CONVICTION, and therefore it is not capable of being owned as the rule of faith or life, *because we do not know it to be the word of God.*"¹ "When the Apostles were all dead, then that apostasy foretold began to appear, and heresies of which the Church was warned began to arise. *But it is greatly to be remarked, there was then no heresy that pretended any foundation from Scripture, but from tradition many:* for it was accounted so glorious a thing to have been taught by an Apostle, that *even good men were willing to believe anything which their scholars pretended to have heard their masters preach. . . .* How many of those [traditions] who did descend and pass on to custom were of a true and apostolical original, and how many were not so, it will be impossible to find now; only, because we are sure there was some false dealing in this matter, and we know there might be much more than we have discovered, we have *no reason to rely upon any tradition for ANY PART of our faith.*"²

As it respects the second and third points, we may judge of Bishop Taylor's views from the following passages:—"The truth, fulness, and sufficiency of Scripture in *all matters of faith and manners* is the principle that I and all Protestants rely upon. And although this be not a first and self-evident principle, yet it is resolved into these that are. 1. Whatsoever God hath said is true. 2. Whatsoever God hath done is good. 3. Whatsoever God intends to bring to pass he hath appointed means sufficient to that end. Now since God hath appointed the Scriptures to *instruct us and make us wise unto salvation, and to make the man of God perfect*, certain it is that this means must needs be sufficient to effect that end. Now that God did do this to this end, to them that believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, is as evident as any first principle. And let these Scriptures be weighed together, and see what they

¹ Pt. 2. bk. 1. § 2. x. 384, 5.

² Ib. § 3. pp. 419, 20.

do amount to. 'Search the Scriptures, for therein ye think to have eternal life.' (John v. 39.) But then to this add what more concerns the New Testament; when St. Luke wrote his gospel, in his preface he tells us, 'that many had taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed amongst us *Christians*, and that he having perfect understanding of all things, *viz. which Christ did and taught*, from the very first, did write *this gospel*, that Theophilus might know the certainty of those things in which he had been instructed.' Now here, if we believe St. Luke, was *no want of anything*; he was fully instructed in all things, and he chose to write that book, that *by that book* Theophilus might know the truth, yea the certainty of all things. Now if we be Christians, and believe St. Luke to be divinely-inspired, this is not indeed a first but an evident principle, that *a book of Scripture can make a man certain and instructed in the whole gospel of Jesus Christ*. To the same purpose is that of St. John (John xx. 31.), 'These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.' The end is salvation by Jesus Christ; the means of effecting this was this writing, the gospel by St. John, and therefore it is a sure principle for Christians to rely upon, the word of God, written by men divinely-inspired, such as Christians believe and confess St. Luke and St. John to be. . . . Let us hear what St. Paul saith in an Epistle written, as it is probable, not long before his death. . . . 'Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, &c.' (2 Tim. iii. 14—17.) Now I demand, does J. S. believe these words to be true? Are the Scriptures able to make us wise unto salvation? Are they profitable to all intents and purposes of the Spirit, that is, to *teach*, to reprove, to correct, to instruct? Is the end of all this economy to make *a Christian man*, yea a Christian bishop, *perfect*? Can he by this dispensation be *thoroughly furnished unto all good works*, and that 'by faith in Jesus Christ'? If so, then

this is the true principle, the apostolical way, the way of God, the way of salvation.”¹

“That it was not lawful for Christians to swear at all, upon any account, was unanimously taught by St. Hilary and St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose and Theophylact.” And hence he draws the conclusion that “a consenting testimony of many Fathers, even of the greatest rank, is no irrefragable argument of the truth or catholic tradition.”² “As the Fathers proved themselves fallible, both as such in writing against heretics, and in testifying concerning the Church’s doctrine in their age; so *in the interpretations of Scripture*, in which, although there be *no universal consent of Fathers in any interpretation of Scripture concerning which questions [are] moved*, so the best and most common consent that is, men of great note recede from it,” &c.³

“This is the discourse of that great Christian philosopher St. Clement; from which, besides the direct testimony given to the fulness and sufficiency of Scripture in all matters of faith or questions in religion; we find him affirming that the Scriptures are a certain, and the only, demonstration of these things; they are the *κρίτηριον*, ‘the rule,’ of judging the controversies of faith; that *the tradition ecclesiastical, that is, the whole doctrine taught by the Church of God, and preached to all men, is in the Scripture*; and therefore that it is *the plenary and perfect repository of tradition, that is, of the doctrine delivered by Christ and his Apostles*; and they who believe not these, are impious. AND LEST ANY MAN SHOULD SAY THAT ‘SUPPOSE SCRIPTURE DO CONTAIN ALL THINGS NECESSARY TO SALVATION, YET IT IS NECESSARY THAT TRADITION, OR some infallible Church, DO EXPOUND THEM, AND THEN IT IS AS LONG AS IT IS BROAD, AND COMES TO THE SAME ISSUE,’ ST. CLEMENT TELLS US HOW THE SCRIPTURES ARE TO BE EXPOUNDED, SAYING THAT ‘THEY WHO RELY UPON THEM MUST EXPOUND SCRIPTURES

¹ Introduction, vol. x. pp. 268—70.

² Ib. p. 319.

³ Ib. p. 321.

BY SCRIPTURES AND BY THE ANALOGY OF FAITH, COMPARING SPIRITUAL THINGS WITH SPIRITUAL, ONE PLACE WITH ANOTHER, A PART WITH THE WHOLE, AND ALL BY THE PROPORTION TO THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES.' THIS WAS THE WAY OF THE CHURCH IN ST. CLEMENT'S TIME, AND THIS IS THE WAY OF OUR CHURCHES."¹

"That the canonical Scriptures should be our *only and entire rule*, we are sufficiently convinced by the title which the Catholic Church gives and always hath given to the Holy Scriptures; for it is *Kanon*, the 'rule' of Christians for their whole religion; the word itself ends this inquiry; for it cannot be a canon if anything be put to it or taken from it, said St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and Varinus."²

And on the great point adduced by Mr. Keble as an instance of the necessity of tradition,³ he says,—“St. Athanasius, speaking concerning the Nicene Council, made no scruple that the question was sufficiently determined concerning the proper divinity of the Son of God, because it was determined and the faith was expounded *according to the Scriptures*; and affirms that ‘the faith so determined was sufficient for the reproof of all impiety,’ meaning in the article of Christ’s divinity, ‘and for the establishment of the orthodox faith in Christ.’ (De Incarn.) Nay, he affirms that ‘the Catholic Christians will neither speak nor endure to hear anything in *religion* that is a stranger to Scripture; it being an evil heart of immodesty to speak those things which are not written.’ (Exh. ad. Mon.) Which words I the rather remark, because this article of the consubstantiality of Christ with the Father is brought as an instance BY THE ROMANISTS of *the necessity of tradition to make up the insufficiency of Scripture*. But not in this only, but for the preaching of the truth indefinitely, that is, *the whole truth of the gospel*, he affirms the Scriptures to be sufficient.”⁴ And elsewhere, in direct opposition to the statement of Mr. Keble,

¹ Bk. 1. § 2. x. 396, 7.

² Ib. pp. 412, 13.

³ See Serm. pp. 32, 35, 41.

⁴ Ib. p. 403.

that "St. Athanasius and the Nicene Fathers were earnest and constant in resorting to tradition *in order to decide among conflicting interpretations of Scripture, and settle the fundamentals of our most holy faith*,"¹ he says,—“At Nice the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son was determined. . . . But whatever it was which was there determined, *I am sure it was not determined by tradition, but by Scripture*. . . . When Constantine the Emperor exhorted the Nicene Fathers to concord in the question then to be disputed, they being Divine matters, he would they should be ended by the authority of the Divine Scriptures. . . . *And they did so*. . . . And the Arians offered to be tried by tradition. . . . St. Athanasius did sometimes pretend to it, though not always; and this shows that there was *no clear, indubitate, notorious, universal tradition in the question*, and if there were not such an one, as good none at all. . . . *From all which it is evident that the questions at Nice were not and could not be determined by tradition*. 2. That tradition might be and was pretended on both sides. 3. That when it is pretended by the contradicting parties with some probability, it can effectually serve neither. 4. That the tradition the Samosatenians and Arians boasted of had in it much probability, when looked upon in its own series and proper state. 5. That the Divine Scriptures were at that time the best firmament of the Church, and defended her from that abuse which might have been imposed upon her under the title of tradition.”²

These passages, while more especially intended, in conformity with the subject of dispute he had then in hand, to show “the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures *to salvation*,” also prove that he held them to be the only source of all religious truth.

There are, however, other passages also in which he speaks still more plainly. Thus he says,—“The Scripture is a full and sufficient rule to Christians in faith and

¹ p. 141.

² *Ib.* § 3. pp. 428—30.

manners."¹ "If we inquire upon what grounds the primitive Church did rely for their *whole religion*, we shall find they knew none else but the Scriptures. 'Ubi Scriptum' was their first inquiry. 'Do the Prophets and the Apostles, the Evangelists or the Epistles, say so? Read it there, and then teach it; else reject it'—*they call upon their charges in the words of Christ, 'Search the Scriptures.'*"² And he brings instances of this in points evidently non-essential; as, for instance, the following from Origen;—"Origen, when he propounded a question concerning the angels guardians of little children, viz., 'When the angels were appointed to them?—at their birth, or at their baptism?'—he adds, 'You see he that will discuss both of them warily, it is his part to produce Scripture for testimony agreeing to one of them both.' That was the way of the doctors then. And *Scripture is so full and perfect to all intents and purposes*, that, for the confirmation of our discourses, Scripture is to be brought, saith Origen. . . . It is evident that therefore Origen requires testimony of Scriptures, not because of the difficulty of things to be inquired, but because, without such testimony, they are not to be believed. For so are his very words; and therefore, whether they be easy or hard, if they be not in Scripture, the questions will be indeterminate."³ Basil, he tells us, says,—“It is right and it is necessary that those things which appertain to use, every one should learn from the Scriptures, both for the replenishing of their mind with piety, as also that they may not be accustomed to human traditions.” “By which words,” says Bishop Taylor, “he not only declares that by the Scriptures our minds are abundantly filled with piety; but that *human traditions*, BY WHICH HE MEANS EVERYTHING THAT IS NOT CONTAINED IN SCRIPTURE, are not to be received; but ought to be, and are best of all banished from our minds, by entertaining of Scripture.”⁴

I will add only two more passages on this point. “By

¹ Bk. i. § 2. x. 384.

² Ib. p. 399.

³ p. 393, 4.

⁴ Ib. pp. 402, 3.

St. Austin's doctrine, the Scripture hath enough for every one, and in all cases of necessary religion, and *much more than what is necessary*; nay, *there is nothing besides it that can come into our rule*. 'The Scripture is the consummation or utmost bounded rule of our doctrine, that we may not dare to be wiser than we ought.' (Lib. De bon. Viduit. c. 1.) And that, not only in the question of widowhood, but 'in all questions which belong unto life and manners of living,' as himself in the same place declares. And it is not only for laies and vulgar persons, but for all men; and NOT ONLY FOR WHAT IS MERELY NECESSARY, BUT TO MAKE US WISE, TO MAKE US PERFECT, SAITH THE APOSTLE, (2 Tim. iii.)"¹ "The tradition of Scripture we receive; but of *nothing else but what is in Scripture*. And if it be asked, why we receive one and not the rest, we answer, because we have but one tradition of things necessary; that is, there is an universal tradition of Scripture, and what concerns it; but none of other things which are not in Scripture; and there is no necessity we should have any; ALL THINGS *necessary and profitable to the salvation of all men, being plainly contained in Scriptures*."²

As it respects matters of practice, the extracts already given show that, at least as to those that are proposed to us as *necessary*, he held Scripture warrant to be the only ground upon which their *necessity* could be rested. Hence, though he may sometimes seem to intimate that the testimony from antiquity to some such points was sufficient to show their Apostolical origin, yet both in his Ductor Dubitantium and his Dissuasive, he grounds their *perpetual obligation* upon the testimony of Scripture, not allowing tradition to be any sufficient proof of a matter having been delivered by the Apostles as of perpetual obligation. So, also, with respect to others; although he sometimes appeared to consider that there were some among them which had a testimony from Church-tradition sufficient to prove their Apostolical origin, yet he held that this could not prove them to be of perpetual

¹ Ib. § 2. p. 411.² Ib. § 3. p. 427.

obligation; and therefore that whether they were of Apostolical origin or not, was not of great moment. Hence, in his *last* work, he says,—“There are many ritual matters, customs, and ceremonies, which were, at least it is said so, practised by the Apostolical Churches; and some, *it may be*, are descended down to us; but, because the Churches practise many things which the Apostles did not, and the Apostles did and ordained many things which the Church does not observe, it will not appertain to the question to say, *there are, or are not, in these things, traditions apostolical.* . . . In these things let the Church of Rome pretend what traditions apostolical she please of this nature, the Church may keep them, or lay them aside, according to what they judge is best.”¹

And his last judgment appears to be that there were none such that could be proved by tradition to be Apostolical, when he says, “That any or more of these [i. e. the Apostolical] Churches did or did not do so, is no argument that such a custom came from the Apostles.”² Even of infant baptism he says, “That there is a tradition from the Apostles so to do, relies but upon two witnesses, Origen and St. Austin; and the latter having received it from the former, it relies wholly upon his single testimony; which is but a pitiful argument to prove a tradition Apostolical; &c.”³

I add below an extract from his most elaborate work, the “*Ductor Dubitantium, or, Rule of Conscience*,” which, if the reader agrees with me in supposing that there is no evidence of a change of views in him, such as our opponents imagine, will still further illustrate his sentiments on the preceding points.⁴

¹ Works, x. 439, 441.

² Ib. p. 450.

³ Works, x. 432. And see p. 437.

⁴ “The topic of tradition after the consignation of the Canon of Scripture was not only of little use in any question of faith or manners, but falsely pretended for many things; and is *unsafe in all questions of present concernment*. In order to the proof of this, I divide the great heap of traditions, which are shovelled together by the Church of Rome, into three little heaps;—1. Of things necessary, or matters of faith; 2. Of things impertinent to the faith,

On the *fourth* position, or the alleged necessity of Church-tradition for the interpretation of Scripture, on account of its *obscurity*, his views are thus expressed;—

“The Protestants believe that the words of Scripture can be as easily understood after they are written in a

and unnecessary; 3. Of things false. The traditions of things necessary are the Trinity of Persons—the consubstantiality of the eternal Son of God with his Father—the baptism of infants—the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son—and original sin—that the Father was not begotten—that the Holy Ghost is God, and to be invoked—that baptism is not to be reiterated—that in Christ there are two natures, and one person. Now that these be appertaining to the faith, I easily grant; but that the truth of these articles, and so much of them as is certain or necessary, is also in Scripture, I appeal to all the books of the Fathers, and of all moderns who do assert them by testimonies from Scripture. . . . ‘All the mysteries of Christ’s nature and person, of his humanity and divinity, are *clearly* set down in both Testaments.’ *But they are not clearly reported in tradition: the Fathers having sometimes spoken in these articles more in the Arian than in the Catholic style, say Hosius, Gordon, Huntly, Gretser, Tanner, Perron, and Fisher. By Scriptures, therefore, the Church confuted the Arians, the Eutychians, the Nestorians, the Monothelites, the Photinians, and the Sabellians.* The other articles are also evidently in the words of Scripture, or in the first consequences and deductions. And when we observe the men of the Church of Rome going about with great pretensions to confirm all their articles by Scriptures, they *plainly invalidate all pretence of necessity of traditions.* If they say that all the Articles of Trent are not to be found in Scripture, let them confess it plainly, and then go look out for proselytes. If they say there are Scriptures for all their articles, then Scripture is sufficient: or else their faith is not. For all these I before reckoned, it is certain both they and we have from Scripture many proofs; and if there were not, I believe tradition would fail us very much; for, *the heresies which oppugned them were very early; and they also had customs and pretences of customs to prescribe for their false doctrines,* as I shall make appear in the following periods. There are also traditions pretended of things which are not necessary, such as are the fast of Lent—godfathers and godmothers in baptism—the mixture of wine and water in the eucharistical chalice—the *keeping of Easter upon the first day of the week*—trine immersion in baptism—the *Apostles’ Creed*—*prayer for the dead*—the Wednesday and the Friday Fast—unction of sick people—*Canon of Scripture*—the *forms of Sacraments*—and the *perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary.* NOW THAT THESE ARE NOT DIVINE TRADITIONS, NOR APOSTOLICAL, APPEARS BY THE DESTITUTION OF THEIR PROPER PROOF. . . . As for others, there are, indeed, a great many pretended to be traditions; but they are false articles, or wicked practices, or uncertain sentences at the best. I reckon some of those which the Roman Church obtrudes, such as are invocation of saints and angels, adoration of them, and worshipping of images, the doctrine of purgatory, &c.” Duct. Dub. or Rule of Consc. Bk. 2. ch. 3. Rule 14. Works, vol. xiii. 120, 121.

book, as when they were spoken in the Churches of the first Christians; and the Apostles and Evangelists did write the life of Christ, his doctrines, the doctrines of faith, as plain as they did speak them; at least as plain as was necessary to the end for which they were written, which is the salvation of our souls."¹ "Of the sufficiency of Scripture, we may be convinced by the very nature of the thing. For the sermons of salvation being preached to all, to the learned and unlearned, it must be a common concern, and therefore fitted to all capacities; and consequently made easy for easy learners. Now this design is plainly signified to us in Scripture by the abbreviations, the symbols and catalogues of 'credenda,' which are short, and plain, and easy; and to which salvation is promised."²

"If in the plain words of Scripture be contained all that is simply necessary to all, then it is clear, by Bellarmine's confession, that St. Austin affirmed that the *plain* places of Scripture are sufficient to all laics, and all idiots, or private persons; and then . . . it is very unnecessary to trouble them with anything else, there being in the world no such treasure and repository of faith and manners, and that so plain, that it was intended for all men, and for all such men is sufficient."³ "To him that shall ask how we shall interpret and understand the Scriptures, I shall give that answer which I have learned from those Fathers whose testimony I have alleged to prove the fulness and sufficiency of Scripture. *For if they were never so full, yet if it be 'fons signatus,' and the waters of salvation do not issue forth to refresh the souls of the weary, full they may be in themselves, but they are NOT SUFFICIENT FOR US, NOR FOR THE WORK OF GOD IN THE SALVATION OF MAN. But that it may appear that the Scriptures are indeed written by the hand of God, and therefore no way deficient from the end of their design, God hath made them PLAIN AND EASY to all people that are willing and obedient.*

¹ Introduc. pp. 273, 4.

² Bk. i. § 2. x. p. 389.

Ib. p. 411.

. . . It is our own fault, our prejudice, our foolish expectations, our carnal fancies, our interests and partialities, make the Scriptures difficult. . . . The Fathers say that, in such things, viz. in which our salvation is concerned, THE SCRIPTURES NEED NO INTERPRETER, BUT A MAN MAY FIND THEM OUT HIMSELF BY HIMSELF. . . . There is no question but there are many places in the Divine Scriptures mysterious, intricate, and secret; but these are for the learned, not the ignorant; for the curious and inquisitive, not for the busied, and employed, and simple; they are not the repositories of salvation; but instances of labour, and occasions of humility, and arguments of forbearance and mutual toleration, and an endearment of reverence and adoration. But *all that by which God brings us to himself, is plain and easy.* The antient Fathers took this way, and taught us to do so too; to expound difficult places by the plain. . . . But then, if there be any obscure places that cannot be so enlightened, what is to be done with them? St. Austin says, (Lib. de Unit. Ecc. c. 16), that ‘in such places let every one abound in his own sense, and expound as well as he can.’ But yet still he calls us to the rule of plain places . . . *the plain places of Scripture are the way of expounding the more obscure, and there is no other, viz. so apt and certain.*”¹

And in reply to the argument made use of by Mr. Keble and Mr. Newman, that where Scripture is alleged on both sides, or its testimony explained away, there it cannot be clear, and certain, and sufficient to determine the point, the Bishop remarks,—“Although the Anabaptists endeavour to elude the arguments of Scripture, yet it follows not that Scripture is not *clear and certain* in the article; *for it is an easy thing to say something to every-thing; but if that be enough against the argument, then no heretic can be convinced by Scripture; and there is in Scripture no pregnant testimony for any point of faith; for in all questions all heretics prattle something. And therefore it is not a wise procedure to say, the adversaries do*

¹ Ib. pp. 413—17.

answer the testimonies of Scripture, and by Scripture cannot be convinced, and therefore choose some other way of probation. For, when that is done, will they be convinced?"¹

These passages at least need no interpreter to show their complete opposition to the system under review.

I pass on to the *fifth* position, on which a passage already quoted has shown pretty clearly the Bishop's views, in which he says, that, "Concerning those books of Scripture of which it was long doubted in the Church whether they were part of the Apostolical Canon of Scripture, there ought to be no pretence that they were delivered for such by the Apostles, at least not by those Churches who doubted of them;" and hence that tradition is not "entire and full in assigning the Canon of Scripture." And the *use* of tradition in this matter is thus cautiously and judiciously stated. "This way of St. Austin is of great and approved use, in the knowing what books are canonical; and in these things it can be had, *in some more, in some less, in all more than can be said against it*; and there is nothing in succeeding times to give a check to our assent in their degrees, because the longer the succession runs, still the more the Church was established in it."²

I will add, however, the following extracts.

"It matters not by what means it be conveyed to us that the Scriptures are the word of God. Oral tradition is an excellent means; but it is *not that alone* by which it is conveyed. For if, by oral tradition, he means *the testimony of the Catholic Church*, it is the best external ministry of this, being A MATTER OF FACT, and of so great concernment. To which the testimony of our adversaries, Jews and heathens, adds no small moment; and the tradition is also conveyed to us by very many writings." . . . "Yea, but if this proposition 'that the Scriptures are the word of God,' is conveyed to us by oral tradition, this must needs be the best and only principle; for, if it be

¹ 1b. § 3. p. 432.

² See p. 722 above.

trusted for the whole, why not for every particular? . . . Besides the ridiculousness of the argument, there is a particular reason why the argument cannot conclude; the reason in brief is this, because it is much easier for any man to carry a letter, than to tell the particular errand; it is easier to tell one thing, than to tell ten thousand; to deliver one thing out of our hand than a multitude out of our mouths; one matter of fact, than very many propositions; as it is easier to convey in writing all Tully's works, than to say by heart, with truth and exactness, any one of his orations. That the Bible was written by inspired men, God setting his seal to their doctrine, confirming, by miracles, what they *first preached and then wrote in a book*—this is a matter of fact; and is no otherwise to be proved, unless God should proceed extraordinarily and by miracle, but by the testimony of wise men, who saw it with their eyes, and heard it with their ears, and felt it with their hands. This was done at first, then only consigned, then witnessed, and thence delivered.”¹

“I wonder why J. S. saith, that for want of tradition we cannot know either right Scripture, Fathers or Councils. *I do not think that by tradition they do know all the books of Scriptures.* Do they know by universal or apostolical tradition that the Epistle to the Hebrews is canonical Scripture? The Church of Rome had no tradition for it for above four hundred years, and they received it at last from the tradition of the Greek Church. . . . And what universal tradition can they pretend for those books which are rejected by some Councils, as particularly that of Laodicea, which is in the Code of the Universal Church, and some of the Fathers, which yet they now receive? Certainly in that age which rejected them there was no catholic tradition for them.”² “The Old and New Testament are agreed upon to be the word of God; and that they are so, is delivered to us by the current descending testimony of all ages of Christianity; and they who *thus* are *first* led into this belief, find *upon trial* great *after-proofs* by argu-

¹ Introd. x. pp. 270, 1.

² Ib. p. 287.

ments both external and internal, and such as cause a *perfect adhesion* to this truth, that they are God's word; an adhesion, I say, so perfect as excludes all manner of practical doubting."¹ "If you will not allow Scripture to give testimony to itself, who shall give testimony to it? . . . 'quoad nos' it is to be allowed to be primely credible, because there is no creature besides it that is so. Indeed God was pleased to find out ways to prove the Scriptures to be his word, his immediate word, by miraculous con-signations and sufficient testimony and confession of enemies, and of all men that were fit to bear witness that these books were written by such men who by miracle were proved to be 'Divini homines,' men endued with God's Spirit, and trusted with his message; and when it was thus far proved by God, it became *the immediate and sole ministry of entire salvation, and the whole repository of the Divine will*; and when things were come thus far, if it be inquired whether the Scriptures were a sufficient institution to salvation, *we need no other*, we can have no better testimony than *itself concerning itself*."²

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.

We pass on to another learned prelate of the English Church, whose name has been put forward by Mr. Keble as an authority in favour of the views we have been considering. It were useless to express the surprise, and more than surprise, with which one views such names so used. I will proceed at once to show his real sentiments on the points in question, for which the extracts already given in former parts of this work will have prepared the reader. I quote principally from *the very same work from which Mr. Keble has given his extract*.³

On the *first point*, then, as to Church-tradition being an unwritten word of God or divine informant, his whole

¹ Bk. 1. § 2. x. 383, 4.

² Ib. pp. 387, 8.

³ A rational account of the grounds of Protestant Religion, being a vindication of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's [Laud's] relation of a Conference, &c., from the pretended answer by T. C. Lond. 1665. fol.

course of reasoning is directly and in terms opposed to it, and he tells us,—“We say that to us, who enjoy the Scriptures as delivered down to us, *the only certain and infallible conveyance of God's word to us is by them.*”¹ Nay, he ridicules the idea of an *unwritten word*. After quoting a passage from Clemens Alexandrinus, intimating that nothing was to be received without the written word, he asks in derision, “Where was *the unwritten word* then?”² Again, still more distinctly ;—“The reason of his [i. e. Archbishop Laud's] *falling on the unwritten word*, is not his fear of stooping to the Church to show it him, and finally depend on her authority, but *to show the unreasonableness of your proceedings, who talk much of an unwritten word, and are not able to prove ANY SUCH THING. If 'he will not believe any unwritten word but what is shown him delivered by the prophets and Apostles,' I think he hath a great deal of reason for such incredulity.*”³

The Bishop then proceeds to observe that the statements of the Romanist whom he was refuting, might be summed up in the three following positions; “1. That there is an *unwritten word* which must be believed by us, containing such doctrinal traditions as are warranted by the Church for Apostolical. 2. That the ground of believing this *unwritten word* is from the infallibility of the Church, which defines it to be so. 3. That our belief of the Scriptures must be grounded on such an *unwritten word* which is warranted by the Church.” The only difference, then, between this Romanist and the Tractators is, that for the infallibility of the Church they would substitute the rule of Vincentius for discovering *catholic consent*, which with them is an *unwritten word*. Does the Bishop hold out any support to such notions when refuting these positions? Far, very far from it; and as for the rule of Vincentius, we shall see hereafter how little weight he attached to it even for the discovery of catholic consent. Proceeding to disprove the first position, he

¹ p. 192.² p. 274.³ p. 161.

says,—“These three things are necessary ingredients of this unwritten word. 1. That it must be *originally Apostolical*; and not only so, but it must be of *Divine revelation to the Apostles* too. For otherwise it cannot be *God’s word* at all, and therefore not his *unwritten word*. I quarrel not at all with you for speaking of an *unwritten word*, IF YOU COULD PROVE IT; for it is evident to me that God’s word is no more so by being written or printed than if it were not so, for the writing adds no authority to the word, but only is a more certain means of conveying it to us. It is therefore God’s word, as it proceeds from him, and that which is now his written word was once his unwritten word; but, however, whatever is God’s word must come from him, and since you derive the source of the unwritten word from the Apostles, *whatever you call an unwritten word you must be sure to derive its pedigree down from them*. So that insisting on that point of time when this was declared and owned for an unwritten word, you must be able to show that it came from the Apostles, otherwise it cannot be owned as an Apostolical tradition. 2. That what you call an unwritten word must be something *doctrinal*, so you call them yourself doctrinal traditions, i. e. such as *contain in them somewhat dogmatical or necessary to be believed by us*; and thence it was this controversie rose from the dispute concerning *the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith*, whether that contained ALL GOD’S WORD, OR ALL MATTERS TO BE BELIEVED OR NO; or, whether there were not some objects of faith which were never written, but conveyed by tradition. 3. That what is thus doctrinal must be declared by the Church to be an Apostolical tradition, which you in terms assert. According, then, to these rules, we come to examine the evidences by you produced for such an unwritten word.” And having examined the instances produced of an unwritten word, among which are the traditions as to *Scripture being the word of God, infant baptism, and the observance of the Lord’s day,*

he concludes, "Among all these instances, therefore, we are yet to seek for such a doctrinal tradition as makes an unwritten word." ¹

Nay, he points out "the great uncertainty of knowing Apostolical traditions, some things having been taken for such which we believe were not so, and others which could not be known whether so or no, by the ages next succeeding the Apostles." (p. 249.)

But above all, let me recommend to Mr. Keble's and the reader's attention the passage already quoted from him, relating to the authority of what is called Catholic consent, and the boasted rule of Vincentius Lirinensis for ascertaining it. "*Wise men who have thoroughly considered of Vincentius his way, though in general they cannot but approve of it so far as to think it highly IMPROBABLE that there should be antiquity, universality, and consent against THE TRUE AND GENUINE SENSE OF SCRIPTURE, yet when they consider this way of Vincentius with all those cautions restrictions and limitations set down by him (l. 1. c. 39), they are apt to think that HE HATH PUT MEN TO A WILD-GOOSE-CHASE TO FIND OUT ANYTHING ACCORDING TO HIS RULES, and that St. Augustine spake a great deal more to the purpose when he spake concerning all the writers of the Church, 'That although they had never so much learning and sanctity, he did not think it true because they thought so, but because they persuaded him to believe it true EITHER FROM THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE OR SOME PROBABLE REASON.'*" ² And, in another place, he shows by an instance out of the Treatise of Vincentius, "how little the judgment of Vincentius Lyrinensis is to be relied on as to traditions," and "*how little certainty in his way of finding out traditions.*" ³

These passages, be it remembered, occur in the very same work from which Mr. Keble has quoted to show that Bishop Stillingfleet held that catholic consent, as ascertained by this rule of Vincentius, is part of the rule of faith!!

And so in another work, he speaks of "the notorious

¹ pp. 161, 162, 166.

² p. 279.

³ p. 247.

uncertainty of mere tradition," adding, "I say *notorious*, because there never was any trial made of it but it failed, even when it had the greatest advantages." ¹

As it respects the *second*, *third*, and *fourth* positions, we shall find him equally in our favour.

Church-tradition forms with him no part of the rule of faith, for, as he says elsewhere, "all faith must suppose a Divine testimony revealing those things to us as the ground on which we believe them." ² Throughout his whole Treatise the Scriptures are invariably and prominently put forward as the sole and sufficient rule of faith. He says,—“Doth not he [i. e. Irenæus] tell us but three chapters before this, ‘That we have received the method or doctrine of our salvation from those persons who preached it, which by God’s command they after delivered in the Scriptures, which were to be the foundation and pillar of our faith.’ Could anything be more fully spoken to our purpose than this is? *Whereby he shows us, now the Scriptures are consigned unto us, what that is which our faith must stand upon . . . that word of God which is delivered to us.* This therefore he elsewhere calls *the unmovable canon of our faith*, as St. Augustine calls it *divinam stateram*, *the divine balance we must weigh the grounds of our belief in.*” ³

“It were easy to multiply the citations out of other books of St. Austin, to show how much he attributed to Scripture as *the only rule of faith.*” ⁴ “*The infallible rule of faith to us is the Scripture, viz. that which LIMITS and BOUNDS the material objects of faith which we are bound to believe, and this doth therefore discover to us what those things are which on the account of the formal object [of faith] we are obliged to believe.*” ⁵ Is it possible to have the view for which we contend more clearly, fully, and explicitly expressed than it is in this passage?

Again; having quoted a passage from Irenæus, he says,

¹ See his “Scripture and tradition compared,” a Sermon on Col. ii. 6. Lond. 1688. 4to. p. 23, or in Bishop Gibson’s *Preservative*, vol. i. tit. 4. p. 186. This was one of his latest works on the subject.

² p. 100.

³ p. 192.

⁴ p. 196.

⁵ p. 208.

—"Can anything be more plain than that Irenæus makes it his design to resolve faith into *the writings* of Christ and his Apostles, and saith that these writings were delivered as a foundation of faith? But doth not Irenæus himself make use of the Church's tradition as the great argument to confute them by? I grant he doth so, and it is on that very account that he might confute them, and not lay down the only sure foundation of Christian faith. For he gives that reason of his doing so in the beginning of the very next chapter. 'For,' saith he, 'when we dispute against them out of the Scripture, they are turned presently to an accusing of the Scriptures as though they were not in all things right, and wanted authority, and BECAUSE OF THEIR AMBIGUITY, AND FOR THAT TRUTH CANNOT BE FOUND OUT BY THEM WITHOUT THE HELP OF TRADITION.' *I need not say, that Irenæus prophesied of you in this saying of his, but it is as true of you as if he had. Your pretences being the very same against the Scriptures being the rule of faith with those of the Valentinians, only that you deny not the truth of what is therein contained, for otherwise the want of authority in themselves, THE AMBIGUITY OF THEM, THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF KNOWING THE SENSE OF THEM WITHOUT TRADITION, ARE THE VERY SAME ARGUMENTS WHICH WITH THE GREATEST POMP AND OSTENTATION ARE PRODUCED BY YOU AGAINST THE SCRIPTURES BEING THE RULE WHEREBY TO JUDGE OF CONTROVERSIES.*"

He then proceeds to say that Irenæus's appeal to tradition is only as to this matter of fact, "whether the Apostles left any oral traditions in the Churches which should be THE RULE TO INTERPRET THE SCRIPTURES BY, or no;" and adds, "THE WHOLE DESIGN OF IRENÆUS IS TO PROVE THE CONTRARY by an appeal to all the Apostolical Churches, and particularly by appealing to the Roman Church . . . he then appealed to it for an evidence against such oral traditions which were pretended to be left by the Apostles, as A RULE TO UNDERSTAND SCRIPTURE BY."¹

¹ pp. 270, 271.

"If Christ and his Apostles did speak according to truth, there is then *need of no oral tradition for our understanding Scripture.*"¹

Again, after referring to a passage of St. Augustine, he says, "After this he [i. e. Augustine] gives directions for understanding hard places, '*First by diligent reading and remembering the plainest places; for in them,*' saith he, '*are found all those things which* CONTAIN MATTERS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.' AN EXCELLENT CITATION FOR YOU FOR SEVERAL PURPOSES, ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU WOULD PROVE THE OBSCURITY OF SCRIPTURE, the necessity of an infallible Judge, or your doctrine of fundamentals, out of St. Augustine. And then bids them compare obscure and easie places together, to understand the proprieties of words, to get knowledge in the tongues, to compare versions, antecedents, and consequents, to be skilled in all human arts and sciences; these and several other instructions to the same purpose are the scope of his following books."²

And elsewhere;—"There are some who pretend that the Apostles' writings were merely accidental and occasional things. . . . But I shall now prove that the writings of the Apostles were intended by the Holy Ghost to be *a standing rule whereby the Church was to judge* which was the true and genuine doctrine of Christ." And having given various proofs of this, he adds, "The design of what I have said is, that although the Gospels and Epistles were written upon particular occasions, yet those occasions were so great and considerable, and the assistance of the Holy Ghost did so direct the hands and pens of the Evangelists and Apostles in writing them, that what they have therein delivered contains *a complete rule* of the true and genuine faith as it was at first delivered to the Church."³

And therefore, when speaking of the use to be made

¹ p. 272.

² p. 194.

³ Scripture and tradition compared. Lond. 1688. 4to, pp. 15—22, or in Bishop Gibson's Preserv. vol. i. tit. 4. pp. 185, 6.

of catholic consent in this matter, the bishop uses the following guarded language;—" And withal it seems reasonable, that because art and subtilty may be used by such who seek to pervert the catholic doctrine, and to wrest the plain places of Scripture which deliver it, so far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary capacities may be able to clear themselves of such mists as are cast before their eyes, *the sense of the Catholic Church in succeeding ages may be a very useful way for us to embrace the true sense of Scripture, especially in the great articles of the Christian faith.* As, for instance, in the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, or the Trinity, though the subtilty of such modern heretics who oppose either of these may so far prevail on persons either not of sufficient judgment or not sufficiently versed in the Scriptures as at present to make them acknowledge the places are not so clear as they imagined them to be, yet they being always otherwise interpreted by the Catholic Church, or the Christian societies of all ages, *lays this potent prejudice against all such attempts, as not to believe such interpretations true till they give a just account why, if the belief of these doctrines were not necessary, the Christians of all ages from the Apostles' times did so unanimously agree in them, that when any began first to oppose them, they were declared and condemned for heretics for their pains.* So that the Church of England doth *very piously* declare her consent with the *antient* Catholic Church in not admitting anything to be delivered as the sense of Scripture which is *contrary* to the consent of the Catholic Church in the four first ages. *Not as though the sense of the Catholic Church were pretended to be any infallible rule of interpreting Scripture in all things which concern the rule of faith,* but that it is a sufficient *prescription* against anything which can be alledged out of Scripture, that if it appear *contrary* to the sense of the Catholic Church from the beginning, it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture. All this security is built upon this strong *presumption*, that nothing contrary to the necessary articles

of faith should be held by the Catholic Church, whose very being depends upon the belief of those things which are necessary to salvation. As long, therefore, as the Church might appear to be truly catholic by those correspondencies which were maintained between the several parts of it, that what was refused by one was so by all, so long this unanimous and uncontradicted sense of the Catholic Church ought to have *a great sway* upon the minds of such who yet profess themselves members of the Catholic Church. From whence it follows that such doctrines may well be judged destructive to the rule of faith which were so unanimously condemned by the Catholic Church within that time." (pp. 58, 59.)

Now here it will be observed, that though the bishop uses language which, *if it stood alone*, might seem to imply his belief that we have the unanimous consent of antiquity in favour of the orthodox faith, and that the Catholic Church was a more pure and exclusive body than we have found it to be, still, notwithstanding this, he does not allow such consent the authority claimed for it by the Tractators. And the reason is plain from his own statements elsewhere, namely, that he did not speak of this "unanimous consent," &c. in the strict sense of the terms, but only as *such* an approximation to it as afforded a probable and confirmatory argument for the truth. That this is the case is undeniable, from the terms in which he has spoken *in the same work* of the Rule of Vincentius, as may be seen in the extracts given above.

Thus also, for instance, he says in a passage which in more than one way shows his adherence to our views, "Next to Scripture *and reason*, I attribute *so much* to the sense of the Christian Church in the ages next succeeding the Apostles, that it is no mean CONFIRMATION to me of *the truth of the* PROTESTANT *way of resolving faith and of the falsity of yours*, that I see the one so exactly concurring and the other so apparently contrary to the unanimous consent of antiquity. For though you love to make a great noise with antiquity among persons *meanly*

conversant in it, [this is spoken, be it remembered, with respect to the Romish *doctrine of tradition*,] yet those who do seriously and impartially inquire into the sense of the Primitive Church, and not *guess at it by the shreds of citations to your hands in your own writers*—which is generally your way—will scarce in anything more palpably discern your juggling and impostures than in your pretence to antiquity.”¹ And so in a *subsequent* work he says, “Suppose the question be not concerning the express articles of this rule of faith, but concerning the *sense and meaning* of them, *how then are we to find out the consent of antiquity?* For they might all agree in the words, and yet have a *different notion of the things*. As Petavius at large *proves*, &c. . . . Here now arises the greatest difficulty to me in this point of tradition; the usefulness of it, I am told, is for explaining *the sense of Scripture*; but there begins a controversy in the Church about the explication of the doctrine of the Trinity. *I desire to know whether Vincentius his rules will help us here?* It is pleaded by St. Hierome (Apol. c. Ruffin. lib. ii.) and others, ‘That the writers of the Church might err in this matter, or speak unwarily in it, before the matter came to be thoroughly discussed.’ If so, *how comes the testimony of erroneous or unwary writers to be the certain means of giving the sense of Scripture?* And in most of the controversies of the Church, this way hath been used to take off the testimony of persons who writ before the controversy began, and spake differently of the matter in debate. I do not deny the truth of the allegation in behalf of those persons, but *to my understanding it plainly shows the incompetency of tradition for giving a certain sense of Scripture, when that tradition is to be taken from the writers of the foregoing ages.*”²

Now surely it is but little to require from those who are acting like the Tractators, that before they put forward the names of our great divines as supporters of

¹ pp. 261, 2.

² Answ. to several Treat. pp. 245, 6. 2d edit. 1674. See vol. i. pp. 272, 3.

their views, they should make themselves somewhat acquainted with their works *as a whole*, and *compare* their statements, (by which alone we can ascertain the real views of any man on such points as those now in dispute), and not, by a partial selection of one or two isolated passages, lead the reader altogether astray as to the real nature of their sentiments. And if Mr. Keble is inclined to carry the investigation of Bishop Stillingfleet's works further, I am quite prepared to follow him, and to show that when his statements are balanced and compared with each other, (as they ought to be,) the representation of his sentiments given above will be found to be a fair one.

To the extracts just given the reader will remember to add *the decisive passages* from another work of the bishop's, occurring in the first volume of this work.¹ And before I pass on, I would just observe, that in his list of "Protestant principles" at the end of his work on the Idolatry of the Church of Rome, he maintains in the thirteenth, that the Scriptures "may be understood by *all* persons who sincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all such things as are necessary for their salvation;" and in the fifteenth, that they "contain in them the whole will of God *so plainly revealed*, that no sober inquirer *can miss* of what is necessary for salvation."

Further, as it respects more particularly the notion of there being some religious truths not contained in Scripture (of which it will be recollected that Mr. Newman has particularized the observance of the Christian Sabbath and the perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord, and Mr. Keble, "the paramount authority of the successors of the Apostles in Church Government," "infant baptism," &c., and which they press upon us as doctrines that formed part of the *depositum* left by the oral tradition of the Apostles with the Church,) thus

¹ See extracts from his Discourse concerning the nature and grounds of the certainty of faith, in answer to J. S. his Catholic Letters (Lond. 1688. 4to.) in vol. i. pp. 612—18 and 633. This, with his "Council of Trent examined," were, I think, the *last* works he published on the subject.

speaks Bishop Stillingfleet;—"Though nothing is to be admitted for matter of faith which wants those three marks [i. e. antiquity, universality, and consent], yet some things may have all three of them, and yet be *no matters of faith at all*. . . . Such as those things are which you insist on as *deposita dogmata* . . . which are *no matters of faith at all*, but either *ritual traditions* or *matters of order*, such as the form and matter of Sacraments, *the hierarchy of the Church*, *Pædobaptism*, not rebaptizing heretics, *the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary*." ¹

Again, in p. 105, he proceeds to vindicate the assertion of Archbishop Laud, "That it may be concluded directly out of Scripture that infants ought to be baptized;" and having proved the truth of this position, he adds, "Had it been *contrary* to Christ's institution, we should not have had such evidence of its early practice in the Church as we have. And here I acknowledge the use of Apostolical tradition to manifest this to us . . . we grant that the practice of the Church from Apostolical times is a great *confirmation* that it was never Christ's intention to have infants excluded from baptism." ² I quote this to show in what way Bishop Stillingfleet made use of tradition in such a case, and what purpose he considered it to answer. To such a use of it of course no reasonable man can object. Its value thus far will be acknowledged by all.

Again, he says, "Your fourth instance is concerning the rebaptization of heretics; concerning which two things are to be considered, *the custom itself*, and the *right and law* on which that custom was grounded. In the places by you cited out of St. Austin, it is plain he speaks of the custom and practice of the Church. . . . But what is this to doctrinal traditions concerning matters of faith? That there were many *ecclesiastical customs* observed in the Church as Apostolical traditions, I deny not, but that is not our present question. *If you therefore inquire into that which is only doctrinal in this case, concerning the right and lawfulness of practice in this case,*

¹ p. 94.

² p. 108.

that he [i. e. Augustine] *fixeth wholly upon the Scriptures*. The practice of the Church in admitting heretics without baptizing them again, might be known by tradition, *but whether the Church did well or ill in it must be, by St. Austin's own confession, determined out of Scripture.*"¹ The doctrine, therefore, connected with an ecclesiastical custom, he considered to rest wholly upon the authority of Scripture.

"If you prove not some tradition thus universally owned and received, which we have no record of, or ground for the observation of, from Scripture, you speak nothing at all to the purpose; but two of those you instance in, *observation of the Lord's Day* and *Pædobaptism*, we have as much as is requisite for the Church's practice from Scripture itself. For the other, Of the use of altars, [adds the Bishop, in a tone of just sarcasm, which those who have thus appealed to his authority, will do well to ponder], it were a work becoming you to deduce the history of them from the *Apostolical times*, beginning at the *ἑνερῶν*, or *upper room*, where the Apostles met, after Christ's ascension; and so tracing them through all the *private houses* and *synagogues* in which the *Christians* in the *Apostles' times* had their solemn assemblies for divine worship, thence bringing down the history of them carefully through all the persecutions, and producing evidences to that purpose out of Tertullian, Origen, Minutius Felix, and Arnobius, *only blotting out* NON, *where they speak of* ALTARS and TEMPLES *among* CHRISTIANS; and telling us that some Protestants had corrupted their books; that where they utterly disown them, they did highly magnifie them; that where they seemed to speak most against them, it was not to let the heathens know that they had them. . . . You do well to wrap up all other such traditions as might vye with the Scriptures for integrity, in a prudent *et cetera*. For you cannot but know that this game of tradition is quite spoiled, if we offer to come to particulars. But it is a fine thing in general to

¹ p. 166.

*talk of the impossibility of corrupting such a tradition, as had its rise from the practice of the Apostles, and was by them delivered to succeeding ages ; and so was universally practised by all Christians, as derived from the Apostles.”*¹

As it respects points of practice, (already noticed indirectly in some of the preceding extracts,) we need nothing more than the following remark, occurring in the same work from which we have just been quoting, to show his mind in the matter. “The practice of the Church,” he says, “in admitting heretics without baptizing them again, might be known by tradition ; but *whether the Church did well or ill in it*, [and therefore whether it was an Apostolical tradition or not], must be by St. Austin’s own confession determined out of Scripture. . . . So that we see S. Augustine *did not himself think it a sufficient proof of Apostolical tradition, that it was a custom of the Church, unless he did likewise produce certain evidence out of Scripture for the confirmation of it.*”² And as it respects in particular the observation of the Lord’s Day, he says, “Though the tradition of the Church be a great confirmation of the Apostolical practice in observation of the Lord’s Day, yet that very practice, and the ground of it, are sufficiently deduced from Scripture.”³

Again, speaking of the difference in the early Church as to the time of observing Easter, he says,—“If some of them did falsify tradition so soon, we see what little certainty there is in the deriving a tradition from the Apostles ; if neither falsified, then it should seem there was no universal practice of the Apostles concerning it ; but they looked on it as a matter of indifferency ; and some might practise one way, and some another. If so, then we are yet further to seek for an universal tradition of the Apostles binding succeeding ages. *For can you possibly think the Apostles did intend to bind unalterably succeeding ages in such things which they used a liberty in themselves?* If, then, it be granted that, in matters of an indifferent nature, the Apostles might practise severally,

¹ p. 245.² Rational Grounds, &c. Pt. 1. c. vi. p. 166.³ *Ib.*

as they saw occasion, *how, then, can we be certain of the Apostles' universal practice in matters of an indifferent nature?* If we cannot be so, *we can have no evidence of an universal tradition of the Apostles, but in some things which they judged necessary.* But whence shall we have this unquestionable evidence, first, that they did such things; and secondly, that they did them with an apprehension of the necessity of them, and with an intention to oblige posterity by their actions? By what rule or measure must we judge of this necessity? By their universal practice? But that brings us into a plain circle; for we must judge of the necessity of it by their universal practice; and we must prove that universal practice by the necessity of the thing. For if the thing were not judged necessary, the Apostles might differ in their practice from one another. Whence, then, shall we prove any practice necessary, unless built on some unalterable ground of reason; and then it is not formally an Apostolical tradition, but the use of that common reason and prudence in matters of a religious nature; or else by some positive law and institution of theirs; and this, supposing it unwritten, must be evidenced from something distinct from their practice, or else you must assert that whatever the Apostles did, they made an unalterable law for; or lastly, *you must quit all unwritten traditions as universal, and must first infer the necessity, and then the universality of their practice, from some record extant in Scripture;* and then you can be no further certain of any universal practice of the Apostles, than you are of the Scriptures; by which it will certainly appear that the Scripture is far more evident and credible, than any universal unwritten tradition."¹ Mr. Keble will, I hope, consider these remarks in connexion with his observations on the consecration of the Eucharist.²

Further, as to the *fifth* position maintained by our opponents, viz. that it is on the authority of Church-tradi-

¹ Ib. Pt. 1. c. viii. p. 246.

² See pp. 49, 50 above.

tion that we know the inspiration and canon of Scripture, and the genuineness of what we receive as such.

“There are,” says the Bishop, “in the question of resolution of faith, these three questions to be resolved: 1. Why I believe those things to be true, which are contained in the Book called the Scripture. 2. Why I believe the doctrine contained in that book to be divine. 3. Why I believe the books themselves to be of divine revelation. . . . 1. If I be asked on what grounds I believe the things to be true which are contained in Scripture, my answer must be, From the greatest evidence of truth which things of that nature are capable of. If, therefore, the persons who are supposed to have writ these things, were such who were fully acquainted with what they writ of, if they were such persons who cannot be suspected of any design to deceive men by their writings, and if I be certain that these which go under the name of their writings are undoubtedly theirs, I must have sufficient grounds to believe the truth of them. Now that the writers of these things cannot be suspected of ignorance, appears by the time and age they writ in, when the story of these things was new; and such multitudes were willing enough to have contradicted it, if anything had been amiss; besides, some of the writers had been intimately conversant with the person and actions of him whom they writ most of. That they could have no intent to deceive, appears from the simplicity and candour, both of their actions and writings, from their contempt of the world, and exposing themselves to the greatest hazards to bear witness to them. That these are the very same writings, appears by all the evidence that can be desired. For we have as great, if not much greater, reason to believe them to be the authors of the books under their names, than any other writers of any books whatsoever; both because the matters are of greater moment, and therefore men might be supposed more inquisitive about them, and that they have been unanimously received for theirs, from the very time of their being first written, except some very few,

which, upon strict examination, were admitted too; and we find these very books cited by the learned Christians under these names in that time, when it had been no difficulty to have found out several of the original copies themselves. When, therefore, they were universally received by Christians, never doubted of by Jews or heathen philosophers, we have as great evidence for this first act of faith, as it is capable of. And he is unreasonable who desires more.

“2. If I be asked, why I believe the doctrine contained in these books to be divine, I must give in two things for answer. 1. That in the age when the doctrine was delivered, there was sufficient reason to believe it divine. 2. That if there was sufficient reason then, we have sufficient reason now.

“1. That in the age when the doctrine was delivered, there was sufficient reason to believe it divine. Supposing, then, that we already believe, upon the former answer, that all the matters of fact be true, I answer, that if Christ did such unparalleled miracles, and rose from the dead, they who heard his doctrine had reason to believe it to be of God; and this, I suppose, the greatest infidel would not deny, if himself had been one of the witnesses of his actions and resurrection.

“2. That if they had reason then, we have so now; because tradition to us doth only supply the want of our senses as to what Christ did and spake; i. e. That tradition, [consisting chiefly (see p. 210,) of the tradition of the Apostles in *Scripture*] is a kind of derivative and perpetuated sensation to us; it being of the same use to us now, which our eyes and ears had been, if we had been actually present when Christ delivered his doctrine, and wrought his miracles. . . . The use of the senses to those who saw the miracles, and heard the doctrine of Christ, was not to give any credibility to either of them, but only to be the means of conveying to them those things which might induce them to believe; the same doth tradition now to us; it doth not, in itself, make the

doctrine more credible, but supplies the use of our senses in a certain conveyance of those things to us, which were the motives to believe then. For the motives to faith, both to them and us, are the same; only the manner of conveyance is different. . . . And this is the way of resolution of faith, which the Scripture itself directs us to. ‘How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will.’ (Heb. ii. 3, 4.) Where we plainly see the resolution of faith as to the divinity of the doctrine, was into the miracles wrought for the confirmation of it, (which was the proper witness or testimony of the Holy Ghost;) but the means of conveyance was by *the tradition of those who were eye and ear witnesses of what Christ said or did*. As, therefore, it was not supposed necessary for them who saw the miracles of Christ, either to have some inward testimony of the Spirit, or some external infallible testimony of *the Church*, to assure them that these miracles were really done by Christ, but God left them to the judgment of sense, so, proportionably, neither of those two is now necessary for the resolution of our faith; but God, instead of the judgment of sense, leaves us to the evidence of tradition [i. e. that tradition which consists principally of the testimony which ‘the eye and ear witnesses of what Christ said and did,’ have left us in the Scriptures. See p. 210, &c.]

“3. On what account do I believe these particular books of Scripture to be God’s word. Which may admit of a double sense: 1. On what account I do believe the doctrine contained in these books to be God’s word. 2. On what account I do believe the books containing this doctrine to be God’s word. As to the first, I have answered already, viz. upon the same rational evidence which God gave, that the testimony of those who delivered was a divine and infallible testimony. To the second, I answer in these two propositions.

“ 1. That the last resolution of faith is not into the infallibility of the instrument of conveyance, but into the infallibility of that doctrine which is thereby conveyed to us. . . . Hence we may discern the difference between the formal object, and the rule of faith; the formal object is that evidence which is given of the infallibility of the testimony of those who delivered the doctrine, [which, as we have seen, he considered to be their miracles]; the infallible rule of faith to us is the Scripture, viz. that which limits and bounds the material objects of faith, which we are bound to believe; and this doth, therefore, discover to us what those things are, which, on the account of the formal object, we are obliged to believe.

“ 2. Those who believe the doctrine of Scripture to be divine, have no reason to question the infallible conveyance of that doctrine to us in those books we call the Scripture. Therefore, whatever things we are to believe in order to salvation, we have as great evidence as we can desire that they are infallibly conveyed to us. 1. If the doctrine of Christ be true and divine, then all the promises he made were accomplished. Now that was one of the greatest, that his Spirit should lead his Apostles into all truth. (John xvi. 13.) Can we, then, reasonably think that if the Apostles had such an infallible assistance of the Spirit of God with them in what they spake in a transitory way to them who heard them, that they should want it in the delivering those records to the Church, which were to be *the standing monuments of this doctrine to all ages and generations?* . . . So that it will appear an absurd thing to assert that the doctrine of Christ is divine, and to question whether we have the infallible records of it. . . . 2. Because these books were owned for divine, by those persons and ages who were most competent judges whether they were so or no. For the age of the Apostles was sufficiently able to judge *whether those things which are said to be spoken by Christ, or written by the Apostles, were really so or no.* And we can have no reason at all to question but *what was delivered by them was infallibly true.* Now, from that first

age we derive our knowledge concerning the authority of these books, which, being conveyed to us in the most unquestionable and universal tradition, we can have no reason in the world to doubt; and therefore the greatest reason firmly to assent that the books we call the Scripture are the infallible records of the word of God.”¹

Where we see that the utmost which is allowed to Church-tradition in this matter is, to bear witness to the *matter of fact* that the books of Scripture were written by those whose names they bear, and were from the first acknowledged by Christians as inspired; and that this testimony *stands not alone* in proof of it.

And this is still further proved by the supposed dialogue he introduces between himself and a heathen, in which he says,—“Will you believe such things wherein persons of several ages, professions, nations, *religions, interests*, are all agreed that they were so? A. Yes, IF IT BE ONLY TO BELIEVE A MATTER OF FACT ON THEIR TESTIMONY; *I can see no ground to question it.* [to which the reply is] THAT IS ALL I DESIRE OF YOU, and therefore you must believe that there was in the world such a person as Jesus Christ, who died and rose again, and while he lived wrought great miracles to confirm his doctrine with; and that he sent out Apostles to preach this doctrine in the world, who likewise did work many miracles, and that some of these persons, the better to preserve and convey this doctrine, did write the substance of all that Christ either did or spake, and withal penned several Epistles to those Churches which were planted by them.” Then having proceeded to prove the divinity of the doctrine by the miracles of Christ and the success of his doctrine, he adds, on the point of the divine inspiration of the Scripture, “If you believe the doctrine to be true and divine, you cannot reasonably question the infallibility of the Scriptures. For in that you read that not only Christ did miracles, but his Apostles too, and therefore their testimony, whether writing or speaking, was equally infalli-

¹ pp. 204, 5, 8, 9.

ble; *all that you want evidence for is, that such persons writ these books, and that, being a matter of fact, was sufficiently proved and acknowledged before,*" namely in that "persons of several ages, professions, nations, *religions, interests,* are all agreed" in it.¹ That is, Church-tradition supplies us only with evidence for the matters of fact connected with this point, and with but *part* of the evidence we have for them.

And so with respect to the genuineness of what we receive as Scripture, though he grants and asserts that "the universal consent of persons of the Christian Church in all ages" would be a *sufficient* ground for our being certain "that the Scripture we have was the same delivered by the Apostles,"² yet he says that this is not the only testimony we have for it, but "we do justly appeal to the antient copies and MSS., which confirm the incorruption of ours."³

Again, combating the idea that we receive the Scriptures "on the sole authority of Church-tradition," he says, "Is there any repugnancy in the thing, that Scripture should be received first upon the account of tradition, and yet afterwards men *resolve their faith* into the Scripture itself? May not a man *very probably believe* that a diamond is sent him from a friend upon the testimony of the messenger who brings it, and yet be *firmly persuaded of it* by discerning the sparklings of it?"⁴

"General tradition at first makes way for the first admission of Scripture, as the general repute of an Embassadour's coming doth for his access to the Prince; the particular tradition of the Church is like the Embassadour's affirming to the Prince that he hath letters of credence with him; but then when he enquires into the certainty of those letters, those motives of credibility (not which relate to the person of the Embassadour but) which evidently prove the sealing of those letters (as the constant testimony of such who were present at it, the Secretaries and Embassadors venturing their lives upon

¹ p. 177.² pp. 211, 12.³ p. 210.⁴ p. 222.

it) must confirm him in that; and lastly, *his own reading the credentials give* [gives] *him the highest confirmation*; i. e. the testimony of those who saw the miracles of Christ and his Apostles, and confirmed the truth of their testimony by their dying for it, are [is] the highest inducement to our believing that the Scriptures were sealed by God himself in the miracles wrought, and written by his own hand, his Spirit infallibly assisting the Apostle; but still, after all this, when *in these very Scriptures we read such things as we cannot reasonably suppose could come from any but God himself*, this doth in the highest degree *settle and confirm our faith*.”¹ And he applauds Justin Martyr for that “in all his discourses, where he had the most occasion administered to him to discover the most certain grounds of Christian faith, he resolves all into the rational evidence of the truth, excellency, and divinity of the doctrine which was contained in the Scriptures.”²

I will add but one more quotation. It is pleaded by the Tractators, as by the Romanists, that as Scripture is known (according to them) by tradition, so the oral tradition of the Apostles may be as to the substance of it known in the same way. The following extract will show Bishop Stillingfleet’s opinion of such a notion. “Your next inquiry is to this sense, whether Apostolical tradition be not as credible as the Scriptures. I answer freely—SUPPOSING IT EQUALLY EVIDENT—what was delivered by the Apostles to the Church by word or writing hath equal credibility. You attempt to prove, ‘That there is equal evidence, because the Scripture is only known by the tradition of the Church to be the same that was recommended by the Apostolical Church, which you have likewise for Apostolical tradition.’ But, 1. Do you mean the same Apostolical tradition here or no, which the Archbishop [Laud] speaks of, i. e. that act of the Apostles whereby they delivered the doctrine of Christ upon their testimony to the world? If you mean this tradition, *for my part I do not understand it as anything really dis-*

¹ p. 260.² p. 267.

tinct from the tradition of the Scripture itself. For although I grant that the Apostles did deliver that doctrine by word as well as writing, yet if that tradition by word had been judged sufficient, I much question whether we had ever had any written records at all. But because of the speedy decay of an oral tradition, if there had been no standing records, it pleased God in his infinite wisdom and goodness to stir up some fit persons to digest those things summarily into writing, which otherwise would have been exposed to several corruptions in a short time. For we see presently in the Church, notwithstanding this, how suddenly the Gnostics, Valentinians, Manichees, and others, did pretend some secret tradition of Christ or his Apostles distinct from their writings. *When, therefore, you can produce as certain evidence for any Apostolical tradition distinct from Scripture as we can do that the books of Scripture were delivered by the Apostles to the Church, you may then be hearkened to, but not before."*¹

The next witness to whom I would refer is

BISHOP PATRICK,

from whose "Discourse about Tradition" Mr. Keble has given an extract. From this passage the system under review can clearly look for no support in more than *one* point, and that is as to the degree of authority to be given to what is called *catholic consent* in the interpretation of Scripture. On this point Bishop Patrick uses expressions in this extract which leave it doubtful what degree of authority he attributed to it. But what is wanted from Mr. Keble's witnesses is not a testimony of this doubtful nature, but one which distinctly declares, in accordance with his system, that such consent is part of the rule of faith. We do not deny, but on the contrary affirm, that our Church *receives* the faith which has the witness of what is popularly called catholic consent, but we do deny that she considers herself bound by the authority of that consent,

¹ p. 210.

i. e. of a certain number of Fathers and Councils, or that it forms any part of her rule of faith. Where does Bishop Patrick assert this? Nowhere. On the contrary, when we come to read his treatise as a whole, we find that in the commencement of it he distinctly states that Church-tradition has but *human* authority, and begins by showing that such texts as 2 Thess. ii. 15, ("hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle"), upon which Mr. Keble appears to ground his reverence for traditions,¹ are nothing to the purpose as an argument for our receiving traditions.

"In this," he says, "we all agree, that the whole Gospel or doctrine of Christ which is now upon record in those books we call the Scriptures, was once unwritten, when it was first preached by our blessed Saviour and his Apostles, which must be noted to remove that small objection with which they of the Roman Church are wont to trouble some people's minds, *merely from the name of traditions*, which St. Paul in his Epistles requires those to whom he writes carefully to observe; particularly in that famous place 2 Thess. ii. 15. 'Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle.' Behold, say they, here are things not written, but delivered by word of mouth, which the Thessalonians are commanded to hold. Very true, should the people of our Church say to those that insist upon this, but behold also, we beseech you, *what* the traditions are of which the Apostle here writes, and mark also *when* it was that they were partly unwritten. For the first of these, it is manifest that he means by traditions, the doctrines which we now *read in the Holy Scriptures*. For the very first word *therefore* is an indication that this verse is an inference from what he had said in the foregoing. Now the things he before treated of are the grand doctrines of the Gospel, or the way of salvation revealed unto us by Christ Jesus from God the Father, who 'hath from the beginning, saith he, vv. 13, 14, chosen you to salva-

¹ Serm. p. 22, and text.

tion through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, whereunto he hath called you,' &c. This is the sum of the gospel; and whatsoever he had delivered unto them about these matters of their sanctification, or of their faith, or of their salvation, by obtaining the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, to which they were chosen and called through their sanctification and faith, this he exhorts them to hold fast, whether it was contained in this Epistle or in his former preaching, for he had not occasion now to write all that he had formerly delivered by word of mouth. Which afterward was put in writing; for mark, (which is the second thing,) *the time when* some things remained unwritten, which was when this Epistle was sent to the Thessalonians. Then some things concerning their salvation were not contained in this letter, but *as yet* delivered only by word of mouth unto *this Church*. I say, to *this Church*; for it doth not follow that all churches whatsoever were, at the time of the writing of this Epistle, without the doctrine of the gospel completely written, because among the Thessalonians some traditions or doctrines were as yet unwritten. Which can in reason be extended no further than to themselves, and to this Epistle, which did not contain all the evangelical doctrine, though other writings, which it is possible were then extant in some other Churches, did. And I say, *as yet* unwritten in that Church, because the Thessalonians no doubt had afterward more communicated to them in writing, besides this Epistle or the former either, viz. all the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, and other Apostolical Epistles, which we now enjoy. Which writings, we may be confident, contain the traditions which the Apostle had delivered to the Thessalonians *by word*, concerning the incarnation, birth, life, miracles, death, resurrection and ascension of our blessed Saviour, and concerning the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the mission of the Apostles, and all the rest which is there recorded for our everlasting instruction. And, therefore, it is in vain to argue from this place that there are still at this day some

unwritten traditions which we are to follow, unless the Apostle had said, ‘hold the traditions which ye have been taught by word which shall never be written.’ And it is to no more purpose to show us the word ‘tradition’ in other places of St. Paul’s writings. . . . It would be too long to explain all the rest of the places of Holy Scripture, which they are wont to allege, [among which is Mr. Keble’s text, 2 Tim. i. 14.] though the word tradition be not mentioned in them, to give a colour to their present pretences.”¹

By these observations about one-half of Mr. Keble’s sermon is answered, for it is an argument for the value of tradition founded upon these texts.

But let us proceed to an examination of the bishop’s views on the particular points which characterize the system under review.

First, As to Church-tradition being a “divine informant,” an “unwritten word of God.”

“If,” he says, “part of God’s word had been written and part unwritten, we cannot but believe there would have been some care taken in the written word, not only to let us know so much, but also inform us whither we should resort to find it, and how we should know it, if it be absolutely necessary for us to be acquainted with it. But there is no such notice nor any such directions left us, nor can any man give us any certain rule to follow in this matter, but only this, *To examine all traditions by the Scripture as the supreme rule of faith, and to admit only such as are conformable thereunto.* It is true, the Fathers sometimes urge tradition as a proof of what they say. But we must know that the Scriptures were not presently communicated among some barbarous nations, and there were some heretics also who either denied the Scriptures, or some part of them. And in these cases it was necessary to appeal to the tradition that was in the Church, and to convince them by the doctrine taught

¹ Disc. about Trad. Pt. i. § 1. See also his Answer to Touchstone of Reformed Gospel, pp. 28, 9.

everywhere by all the bishops. But that (mark this, I pray you,) of which they convinced them by this argument, was *nothing but what is taught in the Scripture*. With which we cannot suffer anything to be equalled in authority, unless we could see it confirmed by the same or equal testimony. *This is the great reason of all, why we cannot admit ANY unwritten traditions to be a part of THE WORD OF GOD which we are BOUND TO BELIEVE, because we cannot find ANY truths so delivered to us as those in the holy Scriptures.*"¹ Which is directly contrary to what Mr. Keble maintains.

And so in another work he says, "We have ever owned, that *Apostolical traditions*, if we knew where to find them in any place but the Bible, are to be received and followed, if delivered by them as of necessary obligation. *But we do likewise say, THAT WE KNOW NO SUCH TRADITIONS.*"² What would he have said, then, to Mr. Keble's "precious apostolical relics?" This passage at once takes away the very foundation of that high authority which is claimed for Catholic consent, on the ground of its delivering to us the oral teaching of the Apostles.

On the *second* and *third* points I would refer to the following passages.

"Whatsoever is delivered by the Church hath the same authority which the Church hath; which, though it be not equal to the foregoing, the Church having no such Divine power, *nor infallible judgment*, as the Apostles had, yet is of such weight and moment that it ought to be revered next to theirs. I mean, *the sense of the whole Church*, which must be acknowledged also to be of greater or lesser authority as it was nearer or farther off from the times of the Apostles."³ This passage shows that Bishop Patrick attached no idea of Divine authority or infallibility to "the sense of the whole Church," and therefore used the words *only in a general sense*, and never thought of making it part of the rule of faith. And

¹ Disc. about Trad. Pt. ii. § 1.

² Answer to Touchstone, p. 27.

³ Disc. about Trad. Introd.

so elsewhere he says, "If we will run up to the true antiquity, there is nothing so antient as the Holy Scriptures. They are the oldest records of religion, and by them if we frame our lives, we are sure it is according to the most authentic and antient directions of piety delivered in the holy oracles of God. . . . And if the old rule be safe, *that is true which is first*, we are safe enough, for there is nothing before this to be our guide, and *there can be nothing after this but must be TRIED BY IT*. According to another rule, as old as reason itself, the first in every kind is the measure of all the rest. And as sure as there is a gospel of God's grace, they that walk after this rule, this Divine Canon, peace shall be upon them and mercy, they being the true Israel or Church of God."¹

Again; "There is no question to be made, but the Apostles taught the first Christians the meaning of those hard places which we find in their and other holy writings. *But who can tell us where to find certainly SO MUCH AS ONE OF THEM?* . . . Nothing is more desirable than those Apostolical interpretations of Scripture, nothing could be more useful, and yet we have NO HOPE *to meet with them either there* [i. e. in the Romish Church] *or indeed ANYWHERE ELSE.*"² A passage diametrically opposed to the statements of the Tractators.

Nay, in the very part quoted by Mr. Keble there is a passage directly against him, in which Bishop Patrick says approvingly that the Fathers made the Scripture "*the complete rule of their faith whereby they ended controversies,*" adding that "there is nothing in the Nicene Creed but what is to be found in the Bible." And so he says in another work, "*Our doctrine is, that the written word is the only rule of our faith.*"³

And, in reply to the charge of the Romanists, that the Protestants affirm "That there is not in the Church one and that an infallible rule for understanding the Holy Scriptures and conserving unity in matters of faith," instead of giving such an answer as would flow from the

¹ Disc. ab. Trad. sub fin.

² Ib. Pt. ii. § 2.

³ Answer to Touchstone, p. 16.

view attributed to him, he says,—“ We believe the Scripture itself gives us *infallible directions for the understanding of its sense in all things necessary*, which if all would follow, there would be unity in matters of necessary belief;”¹ and he distinctly asserts that “ *there is no traditive interpretation of Scripture.*”²

Hence he speaks of catholic consent as “ an argument,” and the decrees of the first four General Councils as “ a great *confirmation* of our belief.”³ And he thus describes the way in which he conceives tradition may be of service. “ We allow,” he says, “ that Tradition gives us a considerable assistance in such points as are not in so many letters and syllables contained in the Scriptures, but may be gathered from thence by good and *manifest* reasoning. Or, in plainer words perhaps, whatsoever tradition *justifies* any doctrine that may be *proved* by the Scriptures, though not found in express terms there, we acknowledge to be of great use, and readily receive and follow it, as serving very much to establish us more firmly in that truth, when we see all Christians have adhered to it. This may be called a *confirming* tradition; of which we have an instance in the doctrine of infant baptism; which some antient Fathers call an Apostolical tradition. Not that it cannot be proved by any place of Scripture; no such matter: for though we do not find it written in so many words that infants are to be baptized, or that the Apostles baptized infants; yet it may be proved out of the Scriptures; and the Fathers themselves who call it an Apostolical tradition, do allege testimonies of the Scriptures to make it good. And therefore, we may be sure, they comprehend the Scriptures within the name of Apostolical tradition, *and believed that this doctrine was gathered out of the Scriptures*, though not expressly treated of there. In like manner we in this Church assert the authority of bishops above presbyters by a divine right. . . . Now this we are persuaded may be *plainly enough proved to any man that is ingenuous, and will fairly consider things, out of the Holy Scriptures*,

¹ 1b. p. 2.² 1b. p. 15.³ Disc. ab. Trad.

WITHOUT THE HELP OF TRADITION. But we also take in the assistance of this for the conviction of gainsayers, &c.”¹

Mr. Keble may reply that the Bishop's expressions in other places as to the authority of catholic consent appear to him equivalent to making it part of the rule of faith; but this is nothing to the purpose, because it is evident that the Bishop himself drew a distinction between the two, and therefore cannot fairly be quoted by Mr. Keble as favouring his views.

As to Church-tradition supplying some divinely-revealed truths not contained at all in Scripture, Bishop Patrick distinctly says,—“*Nothing may be taught as a piece of RELIGION, which hath not the forenamed original,*” [i. e. is contained in the Scriptures]. To which he subjoins merely this remark,—“Yet I must add that those things which have been universally believed, and not contrary to Scripture, though not written at all there, nor to be proved from thence, we do receive as *pious opinions.*” And he instances the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord, “which,” he says, “is so likely a thing, and so universally received, that *I do not see why we should not* look upon it as a genuine Apostolical tradition.”² That this was “universally received” we have already shown to be a mistaken notion, and we have no evidence that Bishop Patrick ever directed his inquiries particularly to this point. But to the reception of it by those who are disposed to entertain it, there can be no possible objection, provided it is not obtruded upon us as a doctrine which we *ought* to hold.

As it respects points of *order* or *practice*, the extracts already given will show Bishop Patrick's view as to the more important of them, as infant baptism, &c. Concerning others he speaks thus; “We *allow* also the traditions of the Church about matters of order, rites, and ceremonies. Only we do not take them to be parts of God's worship; and if they be not appointed in the Holy Scriptures, we believe they may be altered by the same or the like

¹ Ib. Pt. 1. § 5.

² Ib. Pt. 1. § 6.

authority with that which ordained them. So our Church hath excellently and fully resolved as concerning such matters in the 34th article of religion.”¹ And so, further on, speaking of the Church of Rome neglecting to observe some things which tradition mentions as Apostolical, instancing the three immersions in baptism, he says, “And yet there is no such thing now in use in their Church no more than in ours; *who justify ourselves, as I showed above, by a true opinion that rites and ceremonies are not unalterable*; which it is impossible for them to do, unless they will cease to press the necessity of other traditions upon us, which never were so generally received as this which is now abolished. To which may be added the custom of giving the eucharist to infants, which prevailed for several ages, and is called by St. Austin an Apostolical tradition.”² Where we may clearly see, that without undertaking to determine the question whether some of these practices had or had not sufficient proof of their Apostolical origin, he maintains, as the doctrine of our Church, that at any rate they are not of perpetual obligation on the Church, which, practically, amounts to what we contend for.

We come next to the *fourth*, and very important question, as to the necessity of an authoritative interpreter of Scripture even in the fundamental points, on account of the *obscurity* of Scripture.

On this important point thus clearly speaks Bishop Patrick.

“No Protestant will say, that *all* Scriptures are *easy* to be understood. . . . Some are easy, *as much, that is, as is necessary to our salvation.* Which is the express affirmation of St. Chrysostom in many places, ‘All things necessary are manifest.’ Hom. 3. in 2 Thess.”³

Again, in another work, entitled, “Search the Scriptures,” one point which he undertakes to show is, “that most things in the Holy Scriptures are so far from being hard to be understood that they are easy; nay, *ALL things*

¹ Ib. Pt. 1. § 7.² Ib. Pt. 2. § 2.³ Answer to Touchstone, p. 21.

absolutely necessary for us are VERY EASY."¹ "If the words of the Spirit of God, which are as bright as a lamp to give light unto our feet, may be mistaken or abused, then no man, no company of men, no interpreter, no council, can draw up any words but they may be perverted by those who have no mind to be directed by them, but are concerned to put another sense than they intended upon them. And indeed it is no slight argument that the Holy Scriptures are easy to be understood in all things necessary for our instruction, because God would have all, even the meanest capacity, to read them. . . . It would have been in vain to require men to *search the Scriptures*, as not only God, but his Church in antient times, did, if they could not readily there meet with satisfaction."²

"By whose authority did St. John write, or by whose assistance did he perform this work? Was it not by our Saviour's, and by the guidance of the Holy Ghost? And to what purpose was he inspired, but to work faith in those men's souls who read his writings? And what faith was this? Only the belief of some few things which are clear enough, but not sufficient to make us wise unto salvation? No such matter. He wrote that we might have so much faith as should give us eternal life through Christ Jesus. Now who can believe that he who wrote by that Spirit which perfectly knew the several tempers and capacities of every age, and with an intention to breed saving faith in their souls, should yet write so obscurely that he could not be understood of them for whose good and benefit he wrote? Nothing but interest, that is, nothing but that very wicked temper which blinded the Jews, and made them deny our Saviour and crucify him, can induce a man to be of this opinion."³ "Some places of Holy Scripture are hard to be understood by some persons and by some capacities, and in some ages and times, and some matters that are not of general concernment; but in that which concerns men

¹ *Search the Scriptures*, p. 73. 1685. 12mo. ² pp. 92, 3. ³ pp. 94, 5.

of all ages, capacities, and conditions, and to every man in his order and vocation, according to the measure of God's gifts bestowed on him, we affirm, with the greatest reason, that the Scripture is *plain and easy to be understood*, provided men have a will to learn what they are to believe and do.”¹ “The learned may abuse them as well as the unlearned, if they be ill disposed; and the unlearned may get good by them as well as the learned, if they be well affected. There are some things clearer than that any can doubt of them, or stand in need of an interpreter; the *simplest* may *easily* apprehend them, and be instructed by them, if they come with honest and good hearts to learn their duty; and yet the wisest will not apprehend them or not receive them, though never so plain, if their hearts be otherwise bent and ill disposed in their affections.”² “Of this we may be certain, that ‘it is the good pleasure of God,’ as an excellent man speaks, ‘and his unalterable decree, that the Holy Scriptures,’ at least in their drift and design, ‘shall be plain and easy to such as faithfully practise their most plain and easy precepts, but hard and difficult to be understood aright of such as wilfully transgress them.’ There is nothing more perspicuously set down in Holy Scripture than this, as would be easy to show, if it would not enlarge this book too much, from such words as those of St. Peter, ‘God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.’ And therefore, should we admit of any authority equivalent to the Holy Scriptures, the question would still remain, whether the infallibility of that authority could take away that blindness of heart which by God’s just judgment falls upon all those who ‘detain the truth of God in unrighteousness.’ If for their disobedience to evident and plain truths, God punish them with such spiritual darkness that they discern not his will revealed in his written word, no other infallible authority can enlighten them, and make those scales fall from their eyes which hinder their sight in the means of their salvation.

¹ p. 105.² p. 63.

They will everlastingly go on in darkness, because having light presented to them they preferred darkness before it.”¹

Lastly, as to receiving Scripture on the authority of tradition.

On this point thus speaks Bishop Patrick;—“That word of God which was once unwritten being now written, we acknowledge ourselves to be much indebted to the Church of God in all foregoing ages, which hath preserved the Scriptures, and delivered them down to us as his word, which we ought to do unto those that shall succeed us. . . . This tradition we own, it being universal, continued, uninterrupted, and undenied. *Though in truth this is tradition in another sense of the word*, not signifying the doctrine delivered unto us, but the manner and means of its delivery. And therefore, if any member of our Church be pressed by those of the Romish persuasion with this argument for their present traditions, that Scripture itself is come to us by tradition, let them answer thus, Very right, it is so, and we thank God for it; therefore, let this be no part of our dispute, it being a thing presupposed in all discourses about religion, a thing agreed among all Christian people, that we read the word of God when we read the holy Scriptures. Which being delivered to us, and accepted by us as his word, we see no necessity of any other tradition or doctrine which is not to be found there, or cannot be proved from thence, for they tell us they are able to make even the man of God wise unto salvation. And if they press you again, and say, How do you know that some books are canonical and others not, is it not by a constant tradition? Answer them again in this manner, Yes, this is true also . . . but know withal that this universal tradition of the books of Scripture is *no part of the tradition or doctrine delivered*, that is, *no doctrine* distinct from the Scriptures, but *only the instrument or means of conveying that doctrine to us*. In short, it is the *fidelity* of the

¹ pp. 109, 10.

Church with whom the canon of Scripture was deposited, but is no more *a doctrine*, not written in the Scripture, than the tradition or delivery of the *Code* or *Book* of the Civil Law is any opinion or law not written in that Code. . . . *And if they urge you further, and say that the very credit of the Scriptures depends upon tradition, tell them that it is a speech not to be endured, if they mean thereby that it gives the Scripture its authority . . . for it is to say that man gives authority to God's word.* Whereas in truth the holy Scriptures are not therefore of Divine authority, because the Church hath delivered them so to be, but the Church hath delivered them so to be, because it knew them to be of such authority. And if the Church should have conceived or taught otherwise of these writings than as of the undoubted oracles of God, she would have erred damnably in such a tradition. I shall sum up what hath been said in this second particular in a few words. Christ and his Apostles at first taught the Church by word of mouth, but afterward that which they preached was by the commandment of God committed to writing, and delivered unto the Church to be the ground of our faith. Which is no more than Irenæus hath said in express words (lib. iii. c. 1.) speaking of them by whom the gospel came into all nations;—‘which they then preached, but afterward by the will of God delivered unto us in the Scriptures, to be in time to come the foundation and pillar of our faith.’”¹

I proceed to consider the testimony of

DR. WATERLAND,

From whose remarks on “the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity in controversies of faith,” in his Treatise on “The importance of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity,” Mr. Keble has given an extract, to show that he supported the views of the Tractators. From those remarks I am so far from disagreeing, that I scarcely

¹ Disc. about Trad. Pt. 1. § 2.

know a treatise where the subject is, upon the whole, more judiciously handled. And we may observe, that the occasion which led him to write it, would naturally lead him to affix to antiquity *as high a value* as he could suppose to belong to it, as he was vindicating the strength of the argument derived from the testimony of the primitive Church in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity. He is therefore pleading for *all the value* being given to such an argument which it can bear, and the cautious and judicious way in which he does it, shows how *totally opposite* his views were to those of the system under review.

On the extract given in the "Catena," I would make but one observation, and that is, that it would have been well to have let the reader understand that the whole of the former part of that extract has relation only to "the public acts of the antient Church appearing in creeds made use of in baptism, and in the censures passed upon heretics," which would have appeared if the *introductory sentence* to the paragraph quoted had been given, which is important, as showing that in his observations he was referring to certain particular documents, and not to the writings of the Fathers generally. To these documents he appears to allude afterwards, as "writings *then* [i. e. in primitive times] extant," enabling those who lived during the period that the unanimity of the Apostolic Churches lasted, to raise a good "argument" from that unanimity *thus proved*, while *we* can only raise an argument from that unanimity, "provided we have first *proved* [and there lies the difficulty] that the faith we contend for is the very same that obtained in the Churches of that age;" and though some considerable evidence may be obtained on this point, such as still to make it a good *argument*, it is not such as it was then, from the deficiency of documents. This is the precise view he afterwards inculcates, in a passage I shall quote presently.

I now proceed to give some further extracts, which, with one exception, (as noted,) are all taken from the

chapter on "the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity," from which Mr. Keble has quoted.

As it respects the *first* position, the whole chapter shows that such a notion never entered Dr. Waterland's head, as that the Church-tradition we now have, should be considered a divine informant. The following passage will abundantly show this, as well as prepare us for his views on the subsequent points.

"It is pleaded that men ought to *judge for themselves*, to make use of their own understandings, and to admit no *human* authorities. I allow the plea; but I presume it is not hereby meant that we should receive no *human* explications of texts; for then we must receive *none at all*. . . . As to *authority*, in a strict and proper sense, I do not know that the Fathers have any over us; they are all dead men. Therefore we urge not their *authority*, but their *testimony*, their *suffrage*, their *judgment*, as carrying great force of *reason* with it; and *reason* we should all submit to. Taking them in here as *lights* or *helps*, is doing what is *reasonable*, and using our *own understanding* in the best manner, and to the best purposes; it is judging rightly for ourselves. *If it were not so, what prudent man would advise it, or endeavour to persuade others to it?* But, says an objector, do not you follow the Fathers? Yes, as far as *reason* requires, and no farther; therefore this is following our own reason; and he that deserts the Fathers in this instance [the doctrine of the Trinity] deserts himself, and his own reason. Their sentiments, so *antient*, so *universal*, carry the force of AN ARGUMENT along with them; and a very strong argument too, all things considered. Therefore, the being conducted by those sentiments along with Scripture, is the same thing with being convinced or persuaded by *argument*; which is hearkening to right reason, which is submitting to God, who gave us reason for our guide, and not to *human authority*. It is following the safest and best light which Divine Providence has graciously afforded us; for, as a great and good Prelate has observed, 'the *general tradi-*

tion of the Church, next to Scripture, is the best and surest *confirmation* of this great point now in question between us; and that which gives us the *greatest* and *truest* light for the right understanding of the true sense and meaning of Scripture, not only in this, but in most other *important* doctrines of the Christian religion.' (Abp. Tillotson.)" ¹

Here the matter is placed upon its right footing. The testimony of the Fathers on any of the great doctrines of the Christian faith is a good and strong *argument* in favour of that which it supports, and may be highly useful in guiding us to the right understanding of Scripture, but it is no divine informant; it is but the testimony of a certain number of fallible men, whose witness, from their proximity to the times of the Apostles, is of importance.

Dr. Waterland's views, however, will be still more fully manifested in the extracts which I will now proceed to give, with reference to the *second* and *third* positions; and these extracts I have selected so as to show what was his opinion as to the value of the testimony of the primitive Church, and how he applied that testimony.

Speaking of a Roman Catholic insinuating that the doctrine of the Trinity was not to be gathered from Scripture, except through the aid of the Church's expositions, he says, "he pleads under cover for imposing a sense upon Scripture, instead of *taking one from the natural force of the words*. This never was the advice of the ancients; neither ought it to be the practice of the moderns . . . and indeed this gentleman afterwards gives very broad intimations that Scripture is not the *whole* [the italics are *his*] rule of faith. *So now the secret is out; and I suppose by this time it is manifest what cause he is serving.*" (p. 256.) Such is Dr. Waterland's *advocacy* of the notion that Scripture and tradition form jointly the rule of faith.

Proceeding to consider what *is* the value of antiquity in the interpretation of Scripture, he, after noticing the

¹ Works, vol. v. pp. 330, 331.

various ways in which men are likely to be misled, observes, "These things considered, it will be highly expedient to take in all the helps we can procure for the ascertaining the true and full meaning of sacred Writ, and for preserving, so far as in us lies, the doctrines of Christ. No proper means are to be neglected or set aside, lest we fall into error for want of the use of such means, or be found guilty of despising the gifts of God. Now we may come to *the main question*, whether antiquity may not be justly reputed *one of the proper means*, or how far it is so." (p. 260.) He then points out in what ways the antients may be of use to us in this matter, and observes ;—

"I. The antients who lived nearest to the Apostolical times, are of some use to us, considered merely as contemporary writers, for their diction or phraseology. . . . II. A further use of the antient Fathers is seen in their letting us into the knowledge of antiquated rites and customs, upon which some Scripture allusions may be formed. . . . III. The antient Fathers are further useful, as giving us insight into the history of the age in which the sacred books (of the New Testament I mean,) were written. . . . IV. I come, fourthly, to mention some more peculiar and eminent views, in which the *antientest* Fathers may be exceeding *useful* for fixing the sense of Scripture in controverted texts. Those that lived *in or near the Apostolical times*, might retain in memory what the Apostles themselves, or their *immediate* successors, thought and said upon such and such points. And though *there is no trusting in such case to oral tradition, distinct from Scripture*, nor to written, disagreeing with Scripture, yet written accounts consonant to Scripture are of use to *confirm and strengthen* Scripture, and to *ascertain* its true meaning. . . . V. The next consideration is this, that a very particular regard is due to the public acts of the antient Church, appearing in creeds made use of in baptism, and in the censures passed upon heretics; and the observable harmony and unanimity of the several Churches in such acts is a circumstance which adds irre-

sistible force to them. . . . Not that one would, at this time of day, presume to rest an article of faith upon Church records alone, *or upon anything BESIDES Scripture* : but, while the superior proof from sacred Writ is *the ground of our faith*, the subordinate proof from antiquity *may be a good mark of direction* for the interpretation of Scripture in the *prime* doctrines. If we can prove, from antient records, what that faith was, which obtained so universally in the second century, and later, we can then argue from it in like manner, as Irenæus, Hegesippus, Tertullian, yea, and Clemens also, and Origen did, and can make the like use of it, against those that *pervert* Scripture. Only, indeed, there will be this difference, that the argument, as now urged, is become one of the learned kind, and therefore not so well adapted to common capacities, as it formerly was ; and it is somewhat WEAKER TO US in another respect ; as *we have not so many evidences now extant, as those writers then had, whereby to prove such constant succession of doctrine so long, and such unanimity of the Churches in professing it*. But, notwithstanding, we have evidences sufficient to persuade rational men ; and the ARGUMENT is still *a good one, though with some abatements*. VI. There is one consideration more tending still to strengthen the former, and which must by no means be omitted : namely, that the charismata, the extraordinary gifts, were then frequent, visibly rested in and upon the Church, and there only." (pp. 260—72.) Hence he proceeds to draw his conclusions as to "the use of antiquity ;" and lays down, as inferences from the observations already made, these two conclusions ;—(1.) "The least that we can infer, from what hath been already said, is, that the sense of the antients, once known, is an useful *check* upon any *new* interpretations of Scripture, affecting the *main* doctrines. It has a *negative* voice, if I may so call it, in such a case ; and it is reason sufficient for throwing off any such *novel* expositions, that they cross upon the undoubted faith of all the antient Churches, or contain some doctrine, as of *moment*, to be received, which

the antients universally rejected, or never admitted." "A *negative argument*, therefore, being allowed,—as, indeed, there is plain reason for it,—it must be allowed also that the Fathers are of *use* to us, so far as such an *argument* can be of use; and that the antients may be of great use in the Church, in this view, is very apparent; being that they serve as an *outwork*, which Daille takes notice of, for the repelling the presumption of those who would forge a *new faith*." (pp. 275, 277.) (2.) "I would next advance a step farther than the mere negative argument can directly carry us; for I conceive that a just inference may be drawn from that concession, which will extend our views somewhat beyond what I have just now mentioned. If the antients could not be universally ignorant of any necessary doctrine, since it is morally absurd that they should be deficient in necessities; by parity of reason, it must be allowed that they could not generally fall into fundamental errors, because that, also, would be failing in necessities; inasmuch as nothing can be more necessary in our religious concerns, than to stand clear of all pernicious or dangerous mistakes. From whence it follows that, whatever the antient Churches universally admitted as a necessary article of faith, must, at the lowest, be *safe* doctrine." And applying this second principle to the case before him, the doctrine of the Trinity, he adds,—“And because it is hard to conceive how such a doctrine as we are now upon could be *safe*, if it were not *true*, we may reasonably infer that it is *true* as well as *safe*. . . . I apprehend withal, that the same conclusion will more directly and closely follow from the principles before laid down; namely, that, morally speaking, it is absurd to suppose that the primitive Churches should so universally maintain one and the same doctrine, if they had not received it from the beginning; especially considering the *important* nature of the doctrine. . . . Any other pretended sense of Scripture, as implying a kind of moral absurdity, ought to be rejected; *unless* it can be proved to carry with it such a

degree of moral certainty, as is more than sufficient to countervail such *prescription* or *prejudice* against it. . . . It was morally impossible that the primitive Churches should err in doctrines of that high importance, so soon, or so universally." "The sum, then, of the whole case, in few words, is this. 1. We assert that the received doctrine of the Trinity is proved directly to be true, and consequentially to be important, from *Scripture itself, according to the known rules of grammar and criticism*: and such proof cannot be evaded or eluded, without doing *the greatest violence imaginable* to the texts. 2. In the next place, we maintain that the antient Churches taught the same doctrine as an essential, and condemned the contrary opinions as pernicious and dangerous; which consideration makes it now doubly absurd to interpret Scripture in contradiction to that doctrine. 3. The result of the two foregoing considerations is, that since we have thus proved the truth of our doctrine, and the importance of it, both ways, *directly* from *Scripture*, and *indirectly* from the antients, I say the result is, that this is the faith which we ought to contend for; we are morally certain, every way, that it is true; and if true, important of course." (pp. 278—81.) In all these statements in favour of the application of the *argument* from antiquity, as a strong moral confirmation of the truth of the orthodox interpretation of Scripture, I most cordially concur. These statements are altogether different to the high-flying claims in behalf of antiquity, which characterize the system under review; and I have given them at some length, in order that the reader may the better see what was the view, positive as well as negative, taken of this matter by Dr. Waterland.

The following passages, occurring afterwards, in reply to some objections, will still further show that he held the argument from antiquity to be not *authoritative*, but only *probable* and *confirmatory*.

"Comparing Scripture with Scripture is a very good method of interpretation. Yea, and *the best and most satisfactory of any to every rational mind*; but still we do not

see reason why it should be thought to *supersede* any other that is *good*. For after we have thereby obtained all the home light we can get, where will be the harm of admitting still further light, if we can procure it from abroad? The more we have of both kinds the better. . . . The excellent Buddeus, otherwise a very judicious writer, appears not so clear or not so accurate in his account of this matter, as might be wished. He gives his judgment 'that neither *natural reason* nor *tradition* should be the rule of interpreting, but *Scripture itself*, and the *analogy of faith*.' (Isag. ii. 1795.) Had he said neither one nor other, but *all together*, I think he had said right: but as he has taken in only two of the things, excluding the rest, as it seems, from bearing a part in the interpretation of Scripture, he appears to me to have judged wrong upon the case, or at least to have fallen short of his wonted accuracy. For certainly he ought to have allowed *something to natural reason*, and *something* also to *antiquity*, though *not everything*. *There is a great deal of difference between admitting either of them to govern absolutely, and throwing them quite out: and there is a just medium between giving each of them A NEGATIVE, and making either of them SOLE UMPIRE* [which latter is precisely what the Tractators do in respect of antiquity]." (pp. 288, 9.) "A man may be able to evade Scripture alone, who may not be able to evade both Scripture and antiquity; or if he can evade both, yet perhaps not so easily; therefore, if the taking in antiquity is of service, as it reinforces truth, and bears the harder upon error, it is worth the urging; for the same reason as all kinds of arguments or dissuasives against sin and wickedness, are to be urged in due place." (p. 322.) And he tells us, in a former part, that though Tertullian laid so much stress upon tradition, as at that time "an argument drawn from *sensible fact*, more affecting, obvious, and popular, than dry altercations about the authenticity of the books of Scripture, or the precise meaning of words;" yet that, "nevertheless, as often as he employed his pen in controversy with he-

retics, and drew up polemical tracts, though he would not omit to mention the additional advantage he had in point of prescription or tradition, (Contr. Marc. lib. i. c. 1. 20. lib. iii. c. 1. Contr. Prax. c. 2.), yet he chose to *pass it off in short hints, and not to dwell upon it ; but rather to rest the issue of the main cause upon Scripture and reason.*" (pp. 269, 70.)

I add one more extract, taken from a subsequent work. "For the right understanding of Scripture, it is of great moment to know what the most eminent writers or teachers, *antient and modern*, have thought before us on the same subject, and more especially to observe what they unanimously agreed in but THE COMMON REASON OF MANKIND IS PROPERLY THE RULE OF INTERPRETATION . . . and that common reason shines out the brightest, and appears in greatest perfection, in the *united* verdict of the wisest and most excellent men."¹

Further, as to the perfection of Scripture as a rule both of faith and practice, he says;—

"The perfection of Scripture is a point allowed." (p. 283.) "When we say that Scripture is perfect, we mean, generally, as to the matter of it, which is *full and complete to be* A RULE OF LIFE AND MANNERS, without taking in any additional rule to join with it." (Ib.)

On the subject of the *fourth* position, he says;—

"I doubt not to say that the Scripture is *plain enough in this cause [the Trinity] for any honest Turk or Indian to judge of*, who is but able to discern the difference between wresting a text, and giving it an easy and natural interpretation. Nor do I see why a man may not be as *certain* of the construction of Scripture in this article, *from the words themselves, comparing Scriptures with Scriptures*, as he may be of the sense of Homer or Aristotle, of Cicero or Cæsar, in plain and clear passages. Nevertheless, if *over and above this* any further light or strength may arise, from comparing Scripture and antiquity together, it is an additional advantage to our cause, such as

¹ Rev. of Doctrine of Eucharist, Introd. Works, vol. vii. p. 4.

we are thankful for, and constantly make use of. All kinds of evidences are *useful*; and there is so much weakness generally in mankind, that we have no reason to throw aside any assistances given us for relief or remedy. Antiquity, therefore, superadded to Scripture, is what we sincerely value, and pay a great regard to. . . . St. Athanasius and St. Basil pleaded the same cause, and exactly in the same way, as we of the Church of England do. They appealed to Scripture first; speaking for itself, and *proving its own sense to the common reason of mankind*, according to the just rules of grammar and criticism: after that, they referred also to the well-known faith of all the antient Churches, as *superabundantly confirming the same rational and natural construction.*" (pp. 254, 5.)

"We allow that Scripture is *plain in necessities*; yea, it is WHAT WE URGE AND CONTEND FOR;" adding, "while Scripture is plain, antiquity is plain also; and two plain things are better than one. . . . There is so much weakness commonly in human nature, and so much reluctance shown to the reception of divine truths, that we have need of all the plain things we can anywhere procure; and had we twenty more as plain as these, we could *make use* of them all; and, indeed, should be obliged to do so, lest otherwise we should be found guilty of despising the blessings of heaven." "We admit, as I before said, that Scripture is VERY PLAIN IN NECESSARIES." "If they [i. e. antient monuments] were all lost, burnt, or otherwise extinguished, our Scripture proof, supposing Scripture itself to want no proof, would stand firm without them; but when we have the antients to compare with Scripture, and know that, in the very nature of the thing, they ought to tally with each other; the antients now, of consequence, must be either a very strong *confirmation* as to any doctrines held for articles of faith, or as strong an *objection*. They are considerable *disadvantages* where they run counter, and as considerable *advantages* where they favour." (pp. 284—8.)

As it respects the subject of the *fifth* position, I can find

but two incidental allusions to it ; but as they might seem to favour the view opposed in this work, I subjoin them.

The first respects the Canon of Scripture, and intimates that we receive the testimony of the antient Fathers as proof "with respect to the Canon of Scripture," (p. 271.) which we allow ; though we add that it is not the *only* argument, not *the whole* proof, we have for it.

The other respects the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, and is as follows. "Even common Christians," he says, "do enjoy the benefit of it [i. e. antiquity], if not at first hand, yet at the second, third, or fourth. . . . How do they know, for instance, that Scripture is the word of God ? They know it *immediately* or *proximately* from their proper guides, or other instructors ; who, in the last resort, learn it from the antients." (pp. 286, 7.) That Dr. Waterland, however, meant by this, that we believe that Scripture is the word of God, *solely and entirely*, because the antients tell us that it is so, no impartial reader of his works will, I think, conclude. At any rate, it affects not his testimony with regard to the more material points of the system under review, which are included in the former positions.

We come now to the last on Mr. Keble's list, with whose testimony we shall, as proposed, close our counter appeal to his witnesses, viz.

BISHOP VAN MILDERT.

On the extract given by Mr. Keble no further remark seems to be necessary (as there is nothing in it in which we do not fully concur) than to ask how it is that a writer, who is acknowledged to have made the following remark, (occurring in that extract,) can be quoted as advocating the views of the Tractators. "We do not claim for them [i. e. the Fathers] . . . *any absolute authority as Scripture interpreters. The appeal still lies from them, as from all other religious instructors, to that word itself, which was no less their rule of faith, than it is ours.*"

Mr. Keble's extract is taken from the Bishop's Bampton Lectures, entitled, "An Inquiry into the general principles of Scripture-interpretation;" and to this work I shall confine myself in the passages I am now about to give.

On the subject, then, of the *first*, *second*, and *third* positions, we have the following testimonies.

"Traditions, in the sense in which the observance of them is enjoined by the Apostles, are received by Protestants with as much reverence as by the Romish Church. For, according to the Apostolical usage of the word, the traditions enjoined to be observed are the doctrines and precepts delivered, whether orally or in writing, by the Apostles themselves. 'Stand fast,' says St. Paul to the Thessalonians, 'and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epistle,' (2 Thess. ii. 15.) that is, whatever has been *personally delivered to you by me* either in preaching or in writing. Protestants do not question the truth of the position, that the word of an inspired Apostle, whether written or unwritten, is to be regarded with entire deference; since in whatever way the word of God be communicated to us, it has the same claim to our submission, provided we know that it proceeds from him. *But here is the question from which the Romanist has no escape, Can after ages have the same kind of assurance respecting the authenticity of the written and of the unwritten word?* WE CONTEND THAT THERE CANNOT NOW BE SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF ANY SUCH UNWRITTEN TRADITIONS; AND THAT THEREFORE ON THE WRITTEN WORD ONLY WE CAN WITH SAFETY RELY. ON THIS GROUND THE SCRIPTURE IS MAINTAINED TO BE NOW THE ONLY RULE OF FAITH. . . . The Governors of the Church . . . record no intimation given by the sacred writers themselves that their oral communications were to be transmitted to succeeding generations, or promulgated by the Church as authentic documents. On this is founded the distinction between Scripture and unwritten tradition. The former is a

structure compact, and resting on an immovable basis ; *the latter is composed of uncemented materials, AND UNSUPPORTED BY ANY SOLID FOUNDATION.*" (pp. 72—5.)

Stating the general design of his Lectures, he says,—
 " It is purposed to consider in the first place the moral qualification requisite for a right apprehension of the sacred word. An inquiry will then be instituted into *the paramount authority of that word as the rule of faith AND ITS OWN INTERPRETER*:¹ and in connexion with this will follow a consideration of the *subsidiary means* by which, *subject to that authority*, its interpretation must be sought." (p. 22.)

Again, on the text 1 Pet. iv. 11. " If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," he comments thus ; — " The necessity of a constant recurrence to first principles as a preventive of any deviation from truth is in no case more apparent than in the study of Holy Writ. For since the great foundation on which revealed religion is established is an *absolutely Divine authority*, everything which tends to displace that its fundamental basis will endanger the whole system ; and the consequences must be infinitely more injurious to the best interests of mankind than any similar violation of principles in matters of human science ; according to the acknowledged maxims, that the worst of abuses is the abuse of that which is best in itself, and that no truth can be made more certain than by sufficient evidence that it proceeds from God. The Apostolical injunction in the text evidently rests upon the supposition of *this supreme authority of Holy Scripture as the rule of faith AND THE INTERPRETER OF ITS OWN DOCTRINE*. ' If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God ; ' let him, both as to the doctrine and *the interpretation*, be careful to advance nothing contrary to those

¹ Compare with this the following passage in Mr. Newman's Lectures ; — " This is the Anglican principle ; we do not profess to judge of Scripture in greater matters by itself, but by means of an external guide," that external guide being " the early Church." — Newm. p. 183.

Sacred Oracles, nothing that may bring into competition with them authority of a different kind. But, however indisputable the principle may appear on which this injunction is founded, it is not only continually violated through ignorance or inadvertency, but a very great portion of the errors and corruptions prevalent in the Christian world evidently spring from systems *virtually, if not formally*, opposed to it; from maintaining the necessity of some ulterior tribunal of appeal for *the decision of controversies*, and for framing *unerring standards of interpretation*. Besides the moral dispositions, therefore, already shown to be requisite in the search after spiritual knowledge, it is necessary to determine this great preliminary question, Whether there be any authority paramount or even equivalent to the Sacred Word, which either as *jointly connected with it*, or as its judicial superior, may *claim our unreserved obedience*? If there be any such, the sincere inquirer after truth must submit to its pretensions. If there be not, to admit such pretensions is not only superfluous but dangerous; as derogating from the authority which possesses the rightful claim. Upon this head, St. Peter's admonition might be deemed decisive, and there are other texts of Scripture which ought to place it beyond dispute." (pp. 57—9.) And, in reply to the objection of "the Romanist," that "the Scriptures cannot be deemed an infallible rule to the unlearned who read them in translations only . . . and there is besides so much inherent obscurity in the original itself, as to require some authoritative and infallible interpreter to render it an unerring standard of truth," he says,—“Let us consider the question as we are wont to do in the case of a work of merely human authority. Were the purpose simply to ascertain the sense of such a work, that *sense—whatever helps* might be found *useful* for its illustration—*would be sought for in the work itself*, and the book be interpreted as far as possible in conformity with its own declared principles.” (p. 68.) “The full and clear interpretation of these [i. e. spiritual] truths . . . is to be ob-

tained by faithfully comparing together whatever the word of God has made known to us concerning 'spiritual things,'—things above the reach of our natural faculties, and of which we can otherwise obtain no certain or satisfactory information. This principle of interpreting Scripture by Scripture is what theologians call the analogy of faith." (pp. 179, 80.) "Whatever be the authority that assumes a power to determine, *suo jure*, the sense of Scripture THAT AUTHORITY ITSELF, IF ITS RIGHT BE ADMITTED, BECOMES THE RULE OF FAITH, AND VIRTUALLY SUPERSEDES THE OTHER." (p. 72.) "*If we bear in mind that whatever was once immediately communicated to the Sacred Writers by Divine inspiration, has been in effect mediately communicated through them to the rest of mankind, so that they having been 'taught of God,' we also have by their instrumentality been taught of him, we shall perceive that nothing more is wanting to the entire fulfilment of his promises, than that we should faithfully abide by the written word as THE EXCLUSIVE RULE OF FAITH.*" (p. 94.) "'If any man speak,' says the Apostle, 'let him speak as the oracles of God;' let him found his doctrine on the word of God, let him search there for what he intends to deliver as sacred truth; let his first inquiry and his last appeal be directed to that Fountain of heavenly wisdom. In opposition to this principle, different maxims have been inculcated by different parties. If any man speak, says the Papist, let him speak as the oracles of *the Church*; according to PRIMITIVE TRADITIONS, to GENERAL COUNCILS, or to the Pope's Decretals; *whose decisions are infallible.* If any man speak, says the self-called Rationalist, let him speak as the oracles of reason. . . . If any man speak, says the Fanatic, let him speak as the oracles of the inward light. . . . With these several parties the sound SCRIPTURAL CHRISTIAN ¹ has to contend in maintaining the supreme authority of the oracles of God. Upon *the genuine principles of the Protestant reformation*

¹ Compare with this Mr. Newman's observations in his Lectures, pp. 291, 2.

. . . . he has to establish this *main foundation of revealed religion*." "But, [as he justly adds, giving a caution which should never be kept out of sight in this matter,] if, in resisting the claims of these opponents, he hastily conclude that all the oracles which they reverence are to be despised as nothing worth, he will soon find himself on untenable ground. To deny to them that secondary rank to which they are entitled, and to reject them even as auxiliaries in the interpretation of Scripture, must be injurious to the truth itself." (pp. 98—100.) But at the same time how completely he discards the idea of absolute authority being vested anywhere but in the Scriptures appears from the following remarks:—"In this respect private judgment stands upon a similar footing with Church-authority. Both must submit to the word of God, and neither may assume a right over the other, contrary to that word. The individual may not conform to the Church in opposition to Scripture; the Church may not allow the departure of her members from what Scripture declares to be necessary to salvation. As the obedience required on the one hand is conditional, so is the right conferred on the other. Both are limited by the obedience due to the Supreme Power; both are equally subject to Him who 'ruleth over all.' The responsibility, therefore, on either side is great." (p. 111.) And in a note on this passage he adds, "This is certainly a point of great nicety and of difficult adjustment. IF IT BE ASKED, WHAT IS TO BE DONE WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL THINKS THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH EVIDENTLY UNSCRIPTURAL IN ESSENTIAL POINTS, AND THE CHURCH FORBIDS HIM TO DEPART FROM IT,—WHETHER HE OUGHT NOT IN THAT CASE TO DEPART FROM IT?—THE ANSWER MUST SURELY BE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE." (p. 341.)¹

The following passage seems peculiarly full and explicit, and clearly to make Scripture the only source of *all* religious truth.

¹ The reader may compare with this the observations of Mr. Newman on this subject, pp. 160 and 320.

“The expressions used by the sacred writers, whether of the Old or New Testament, in speaking of the word of God, evidently go to the extent of asserting its *perfection in itself*, and its sufficiency for those on whom it was bestowed. The appeal to it also, whenever such appeal is made either by our Lord or his Apostles, is no less clearly grounded on the supposition that it was sufficient for the conviction and satisfaction of the persons whom they addressed. The Old Testament was sufficient to bring the Jews to the knowledge of the Messiah when he should appear, and to the reception of the Gospel when it should be promulgated to them. The Jews whom our Lord conversed with are considered on this ground as without excuse. The persons to whom the Apostles addressed their discourses or writings are also pressed by them with arguments drawn from the Scriptures then extant, which are always appealed to as fully sufficient to enable them to judge of the reasoning set before them. What writings of the New Testament, whether Gospels or Epistles, might be in circulation among the primitive Christians at the time when these references to Scripture were made, it is not material to inquire. Their gradual increase arose out of the immediate exigences of the Church; and so long as the Evangelists and Apostles lived, accessions were made to the written word; and by the good providence of God so many of them as might be necessary for the edification of the Church in after times, have been preserved and transmitted from generation to generation. The argument therefore stands thus: that if the *fewer* portions of Holy Writ then extant; if the Old Testament alone, or accompanied with only certain portions of the New, were spoken of by the inspired preachers of that day as *full, perfect, and sufficient for general edification*, we may with unhesitating confidence affirm the same, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, of the *entire* collection as it now exists. Nay, we may no less confidently argue, that, since no evidence is adduced, nor even pretended, that there are any other books now extant, stamped with the

same seal of Divine authority, we have, in the very cessation of these extraordinary means of instruction, an indubitable token of the Divine purpose in this respect. We learn from it that God in his infinite wisdom designed these to be *a complete, entire, and sufficient revelation of his will*, without any ulterior communications of a similar kind. Nothing can invalidate this conclusion but clear evidence *from Scripture itself* that *unwritten traditions* were afterwards to be admitted *as supplementary to the Sacred Writings*, and to be placed upon the same level with them in point of authority." (pp. 321, 2.)

And that he intended to include in these remarks points of *practice* as well as of faith, is sufficiently evident, by the following extract he has given from De Moor, as illustrative of his meaning. "Tradit Scriptura res Religionis perfecte et sufficienter. Bellarminus, lib. iv. De Verbo Dei, cap. 4. probare satagit, Quod Scripturæ non omnia *ita* contineant ut sufficiant ipsæ sine alia traditione, vide tom. i. Controv. col. 211. Nos ex adverso tenemus Scripturæ *perfectionem*, per quam illa sola sit regula totalis et adæquata fidei *et morum*." (p. 319.; and see a similar extract from Dr. Waterland, p. 309.)

On the subject of the *fourth* position we have the following testimony.

" 'The faith once delivered to the saints' was committed to writing by the Sacred Penmen, that we might believe '*through their word*.' *Nothing, therefore, is now necessary, but to bring to their elucidation the best human attainments, moral and intellectual, together with those ordinary aids of the Holy Spirit which the great author and finisher of our faith has promised to them who sincerely seek the truth.*" (pp. 91, 2. ed. 1815.)

Speaking of the erroneous pretensions to authoritative interpretation set up on behalf of tradition, human reason, and private illumination, he says,—“They all proceed on a supposition that there is some *imperfection or insufficiency in the Scriptures*, which is to be supplied by one or other of these infallible remedies. In these false concep-

tions of the subject each is equally reprehensible. *Each confounds what ought to be carefully distinguished, the obscurity of the doctrines revealed in Scripture with the obscurity of Scripture itself; as if a doctrine might not be laid down in a clear and distinct manner, although it be in itself above the full comprehension of the human faculties.* Each is also equally defective in the remedy it proposes. For it is not oral tradition nor human infallibility, if such were to be found, nor the utmost perfection of human reason, nor such illuminations as enthusiasts rely upon, that can throw *more light upon the doctrines than the Scriptures have already shed upon them.* The same insurmountable barriers betwixt Divine and human knowledge will still remain, and by faith alone will the doctrines be received." (p. 95.) "A reputed saying of rabbinical writers, that 'there is no difficulty in their Law of which the Law itself does not afford a solution,' is applicable to the Scriptures in general, both of the Old and New Testament." (pp. 190, 1.) And hence he presses upon the reader the importance of interpreting Scripture by itself. "Difficulties," he says, "are to be removed in the first place by the help of Scripture itself." (p. 191. See the whole of Sermon 6, pp. 177, &c.)

"The Bible, though often profound and mysterious in its *subject*, does for the most part propose its truths in terms adapted to general apprehension." (p. 218.)

Speaking of the doctrines of the unity of the Godhead, the co-existence and co-equality of the Son and the Holy Spirit with the Father, and the union of the divine and human nature in the person of our Lord, he says,—"*To a plain unprejudiced reader they are all indeed so evidently contained in Scripture, that were they not accompanied with acknowledged difficulties in reconciling them with each other, they would probably be universally received.*" (p. 210.) And instead of endeavouring to account for the prevalence of heresies and divisions in doctrine on fundamental points, from any obscurity in the word of God respecting them, he traces them at once to their true cause. "*The*

main source," he says, "of all contentions respecting the sense of Scripture on points of fundamental importance, may be traced to a reluctance, on one side or the other, to renounce prepossessions militating against an entire reception of the truth. Men are led by partiality to their own opinions, or undue deference to those of others, not only to irreconcilable dissensions among themselves, but eventually to a departure from the plain and obvious meaning of the word of God." (p. 49.)

And finally he quotes, as illustrative of his views, the following, among other, passages.

From Bandinel's Bampton Lectures as follows,—"*The doctrines of Christianity are laid down in Scripture with a plainness and perspicuity sufficient and satisfactory to every well-disposed mind.*" (p. 300.)

From Glassii Philol. Sacr. the following,—"*Omnis fidei articulus in Scripturis alicubi ex professo propriis et perspicuis verbis est expositus, quæ illius articuli propria quasi sedes et domicilium est. Nihil est obscure dictum in Scripturis quod spectet ad fidem vel mores, quod non planissime dictum sit in aliis locis.*" (p. 396.) The italics are the bishop's.

And from Dr. Waterland he remarks, that "most of the abuses with regard to the interpreting of Scripture, when traced up to their fountain-head, will appear to have been owing to this, that some will fancy the plain and obvious sense unreasonable or absurd, when it really is not; and will thereupon obtrude their own surmises, conjectures, and prejudices, upon the word of God." (p. 404.)

On the subject of the *fifth* position we have the following testimony;—

"The Canon of Scripture was determined by the Church upon evidence of its genuineness and authenticity; and to this the Church bears witness. *The truth of Scripture rests on other grounds; on the 'witness of God' as well as 'the witness of men.'*" (pp. 75, 6.)

I conclude the whole with the following decisive testimony of this last witness.

“THE DEFERENCE WHICH THE FATHERS ALWAYS PAID TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AS THE SOLE AUTHORITY OF FAITH, IS SUFFICIENT TO GUIDE US IN THE DEFERENCE WHICH THEY WOULD HAVE ADMITTED TO BE DUE TO THEMSELVES.” (p. 344.)

Such, then, are the sentiments of the principal divines to whom Mr. Keble has referred as *supporting* his views of tradition; sentiments expressed in many cases, as we have seen, in the very works from which Mr. Keble has taken his extracts.

Mr. Newman is in precisely the same situation with Mr. Keble in this respect. Having interspersed in his Lectures several quotations from Taylor, Stillingfleet, Waterland, and Van Mildert, and *applied* them to the support of his views, he draws the conclusion that his “view of catholic tradition” is “received from and maintained by our great divines,” and very coolly adds, “If it could be proved contrary to anything they have elsewhere maintained, this would be to accuse them of inconsistency, which I leave to our enemies to do.” (p. 318.) Now if, as this sentence seems to intimate, Mr. Newman was conscious that they had elsewhere maintained views contrary to his, it would not only have been but fair in him to have stated as much, but have afforded sufficient ground for doubt whether he had not misinterpreted their views in the passages he has quoted. Their statements, when taken as a whole, are perfectly self-consistent; and I am not at all fearful of being reckoned their enemy, for having shown them to be opponents of the system under review.

Am I, then, speaking too strongly when I say, that the Tractators, instead of boasting any longer of the support to be found for their system in the works of our most learned and able divines, are bound to explain how it is that they have been so far misled as ever to make such

a claim. I am far from asserting that there has been any *intentional* misrepresentation of the views of those quoted; much allowance is to be made for a prejudiced eye and imperfect information; but that they have been misrepresented is, I suppose, placed beyond contradiction, by the extracts which have just been given. In whatever way, then, we may be enabled to account for it, certain it is that *truth has been sacrificed*, and the authority of great names pleaded in behalf of a system in no respect entitled to such protection. Nor is it possible to acquit those who had *the means of information* open to them, of culpable neglect in not ascertaining the real state of the case, in a matter of such importance, before they made use of the names of our most learned and esteemed divines as supporters of doctrines which they have expressly repudiated.

THE END.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY G. J. PALMER, SAVOY STREET.







A 000 038 010 5

